

ZIONIST PAMPHLETS

SERIES I

Edited by
H. SACHER LEON SIMON S. LANDMAN

CONTENTS

1. Zionism and the Jewish Problem
By Leon Simon
 2. Zionism and Jewish Culture
By Norman Bentwich
 3. History of Zionism
By S. Landman
 4. A Hebrew University for Jerusalem
By H. Sacher
 5. Zionism and the State
By H. Sacher
 6. Zionism and the Jewish Religion
By F. S. Spiers
 7. Palestine and the Hebrew Revival
By E. Miller
 8. Hebrew Education in Palestine
By Leon Simon
 9. Jewish Colonization and Enterprise in Palestine
By Israel M. Sieff
 10. Zionism: Its Organization and Institutions
By S. Landman
-

Published by "The Zionist," London, England
1915-1916

Sold in America by
BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY
"The Jewish Book Concern"
NEW YORK



DS 149 .A1 Z56 1915

Zionist pamphlets





Prefatory Note.

✓ Zionist Pamphlets.
Ser. 1.

WITH the outbreak of the War the continued publication of the "Zionist" became extremely difficult, and after careful consideration the Editors decided to suspend it. They are, however, fully conscious of the need of informing the Jewish and non-Jewish world as to the spirit, aims, machinery and achievements of Zionism. They have come to the conclusion that under present circumstances the best way of meeting this need is by the issue of a series of Zionist pamphlets, dealing comprehensively with every aspect of Jewish Nationalism.

This pamphlet, on "Zionism and the Jewish Problem," is the first of the series. Arrangements are in hand for the production of the following further pamphlets to be published at short intervals:—

History of Zionism.

Zionism, its Organization and Institutions.

Jewish Colonisation and Enterprise in Palestine.

Hebrew Education in Palestine.

A Hebrew University for Jerusalem.

Zionism and the Jewish Religion.

Zionism and Jewish Culture.

Zionism and the State.

Palestine and the Hebrew Revival.

The Editors believe that this is the first time in the history of the Zionist movement that an enterprise of this kind has been attempted. For the possibility of carrying it out, they are indebted to the financial assistance of a few Zionists, who believe with them that a knowledge of the true facts would make Zionism appeal to a large number of people who have not had, or have not sought, the opportunity of knowing what Zionism means.

The subscription for the whole series is 2/6 post free. Subscriptions should be sent to the Manager of "The Zionist," 4, King's Bench Walk, Temple, London, E.C.

March, 1915.

Zionism and the Jewish Problem.

The phrase "The Jewish Problem" is current on the lips of Jews and non-Jews alike. Its use indicates not so much a clear understanding of a definite problem which requires solution as a vague sense that there is something wrong about the position of the Jews in the modern world. The average English Jew, if he were asked what exactly is wrong, would probably say that there are a large number of Jews in the world who live under bad conditions, being either denied elementary human rights or exposed to social prejudice and the attacks of anti-Semites. He would define "the Jewish Problem," if he were pressed to define it, as the problem of obtaining decent treatment for Jews everywhere. But a very little cross-questioning would force him to confess that this definition was inadequate. He would have to admit that even in England, where anti-Semitism is practically unknown, there is none the less a Jewish problem, because the Synagogues are empty, and the younger generation does not seem to be so Jewish as its parents, and there is a great deal of drift into assimilation and intermarriage. If he were pressed further, he might be compelled to admit that the most Jewish Jews are those who live in countries where the Jews are not decently treated; that it is only the influx of Jews from those countries that saves the Jews of England from absorption, and that, therefore, from one point of view, the Jewish problem is more acute in England than in Russia. At all events, it would become clear that the problem is a more complex one than he had imagined, and is not to be solved simply by the grant of equal rights to Jews everywhere. The real solution must

lie in something that goes to the heart of the problem. That Jews are persecuted in one country, attacked by anti-Semites in another, and assimilated in a third—these are only the forms in which the problem presents itself. We must get beneath the forms, and find the cause of these different phenomena. Then we shall know what the problem is, and if we can remove the cause we shall have solved the problem.

The root cause to which these different phenomena are traceable, put in its simplest terms, is that the Jew is nowhere at home. He is not only a stranger in every country, but a stranger who comes from nowhere. Hence he is exposed everywhere to the mistrust and dislike which men feel for the stranger, the man who is different from themselves. In some countries this mistrust and dislike show themselves in the form of positive persecution and restriction; in others, they appear in the milder forms of anti-Semitism. How shall the Jew escape these evils? There is apparently only one way. He must endeavour to make good his claim to be accepted as an equal by showing that he can cease to be different—that he can sink his own individuality and become an exact copy of his neighbour. Naturally, he cannot do that completely without ceasing to be a Jew altogether. So, despite his efforts to become exactly like his neighbour, he remains something different, and his neighbour remains conscious of the difference. Thus the phenomena of assimilation and anti-Semitism show themselves side by side, and the very men who try hardest to assimilate are the targets for the arrows of the anti-Semite.

In a country where Jews play a large part in economic and intellectual life their success arouses the envy and hatred of those who feel that these aliens have no right to be running their businesses and writing their literature. And yet these very Jews may be Jews only in spite of themselves—only in so far as they cannot get rid of their distinctively Jewish characteristics. Even where open anti-Semitism does not prevail, it happens often enough that the

reputation of Jews as a people suffers precisely because of an individual Jew who has lost all contact with Jews and Judaism. Such a man is of no service to his people, but he is made on occasion a stick to beat them with. Neither he nor his people is allowed to forget that he is a Jew so soon as he achieves an undesirable notoriety. Sometimes, again, a non-Jew who wishes to be friendly will demonstrate the excellent qualities of Jews by saying that he has known Jews for years without suspecting their Jewish origin; or a Jew will himself boast that throughout a long literary career he has never betrayed his Jewishness by a single word. Such tragi-comedies as these can happen only in the life of a people which is not a people, which cannot be either itself or something else, but is always partly the one and partly the other.

A people without a homeland of its own, without a centre in which its individuality can take shape in concrete institutions, loses the respect both of itself and of other peoples. Respect demands understanding; but the Jewish people, situated as it is at present, cannot be understood—it cannot be understood even by Jews, and they begin to have doubts of its existence, because it has no recognised central institutions through which its ideas and aspirations can voice themselves. Hence, too, Judaism is always in solution; nobody can say what Judaism is, nor what being a Jew means. We can only attempt to say what Judaism ought to be and what a Jew ought to do. But even our abstract definitions of Judaism and of the Jew as he ought to be are a chaos of opposing conceptions, because we have no living reality to serve as a guiding norm. And so Judaism loses its hold on the individual Jew, and the process known as “assimilation” becomes possible. The tragedy of assimilation is not that the Jew ceases to be a Jew, but that he remains a Jew and becomes something else at the same time. He becomes an anomaly, Jew and not-Jew in one. He is bound by a close and well-defined tie to the people of his adoption; but he is also bound by a loose and indefinable tie to Jews in other countries, however much they may differ from him

in religious ideas or political status. This anomalous position he can end at present only in one way—by giving up the Jewish tie. But it ought to be possible for him to end it by the other alternative, by rejoining the Jewish people.

He would have that possibility, if there were a concrete Jewish life of which he could become a member at the expense of renouncing something else—in other words, if the Jewish people had a home. Obviously, not all Jews could or would avail themselves of that possibility. It would only be a minority of the Jews in the world who would actually return to their own land and their own people. For that minority the escape from the conditions of which anti-Semitism and assimilation are the fruits would be complete. But for the majority also, for those who remained outside the Jewish land, the existence of a centre of Jewish life would be a fact of profound significance. It would give Judaism a new meaning and reality in their lives. They would see in the Jewish land a living expression of the Jewish character and Jewish ideals; they would have in it a standard by which to measure their own Judaism, and a source of spiritual influence to keep their Judaism from decay. They would no longer feel it necessary to aim at becoming exact copies of their neighbours; they would find it worth while to be different from their neighbours, even at some cost to themselves. They would be proud to carry into the world something of the Jewish outlook on life, and to help in bringing the world to a better understanding of that outlook. Thus they would be a spiritual force in the world, giving as well as taking, and earning their right to a place in civilisation by remaining Jews, not by renouncing Judaism or whittling it away to nothing.

At present there is no centre in which the Jewish people can live its own life, and from which Jews elsewhere can derive the knowledge and the influence of the Jewish outlook. The Jewish people, so far as it exists at all except in idea, is to be found in the great ghettos of Eastern Europe. There Jews live as Jews, untroubled—or troubled comparatively little—

by the need to accommodate the fact of their Jewishness, and the mode of life in which that fact expresses itself, to non-Jewish conceptions and institutions. In the ghetto Jews have developed a form of life which is their own, determined primarily by their own national character; and that centre of Jewish life has been for over a century the great reservoir of Judaism, the source from which the scattered Jewish communities outside it have been able to draw something of Jewish feeling and Jewish culture. It is because of the existence of that centre of Jewish life that the Jew in lands of freedom is able to remain in some measure a Jew, to import some treasured relics of his own tradition into the non-Jewish life which he is compelled to live. But, much as the emancipated Jew owes to the ghetto, he is unable to look on it with respect and affection as the source of his Judaism and the standard expression of what Judaism should be, or to imagine himself returning to it in order to regain closer contact with his people. To leave the ghetto is to escape from slavery to freedom, from darkness to light; and no sane man would travel in the reverse direction. For the Jews of the ghetto themselves, escape into better conditions is an ideal; return to it can never be an ideal. Thus the ghetto—the only concrete form in which the life of the Jewish people exists—cannot perform the function of a national centre. It has no moral hold on those Jews who are outside it, and it is a matter of necessity, not of choice, for those who remain in it. No Jew can point to it with pride and say, “That is the home of my people, that is how Jews live when they are able to live as members of the Jewish people.”

But even if the Jewry of Eastern Europe could perform that function, its day seems to be passing. It no longer holds together and resists external attack as it did. Before our eyes it is being broken up by the combined forces of persecution and European culture. Its time-hallowed institutions are losing their hold on those who are brought up under their influence; its capacity to reproduce a single type of life from generation to generation is undermined. The present war,

bringing unthinkable loss and suffering to the Jewish masses, must hasten the process of disruption. That process will not be completed in a year or in a generation; but it goes on surely and not slowly, and it will end in the disappearance of the ghetto as we know it, the ghetto through which whatever of Judaism survives has come into the modern world. And with the ghetto there disappears the one unifying force in Jewry, the one concrete link between the present and the past. For centuries Judaism has had a home—though neither a comfortable nor a beautiful home—in the ghetto, where alone the Jewish people has lived as the Jewish people. If the ghetto disappears—and who does not want it to disappear?—Judaism will be left without even the semblance of a home, and the will and the power of the Jew to be a Jew will be weakened still further.

The Jewish people without a home and Judaism without a home—these are two sides of the same fact. For Judaism and the Jewish people are related as soul and body, and neither can exist without the other. And similarly the anomalous position of the Jews in the modern world and the decay of Judaism are two sides of the same fact. The Jew is both Jew and not-Jew, and is unable to be completely either, because there is no concrete embodiment of Judaism from which he can learn to understand what Judaism is.

It is this central problem—the homelessness of the Jewish people and of Judaism—that Zionism attacks. Its distinctive feature is that it sees the problem as a national one, not as the problem of this or that group of individual Jews; and it aims at removing the conditions which make the problem so acute, not at administering a palliative here or there. For so long as the conditions remain, the problem must always recur. So long as the Jewish people remains without a home, it must always be faced with the same terrible alternative—either a cramped and stunted Jewish life in the ghetto, or the decay of Judaism and the Jewish consciousness under emancipation. But to find a home for the Jewish people does not

mean to congregate all Jews together in one place. That is obviously impossible, even if it were desirable. The millions of Jews in Russia could not be transplanted by the wave of a wand to a Jewish land ; and any gradual emigration must be more or less counterbalanced by the natural growth of population. The economic problem of the Jews in Russia must be settled, for the great mass of them, in that country itself. Emancipated Jews, again, are for the most part unwilling to leave the countries of their adoption. Materially speaking, they are sufficiently well off where they are, and it will only be a minority in whom the Jewish consciousness will be sufficiently strong to draw them back to their own people. But, taking East and West together, there is a sufficiently large number of Jews who would be eager, given the opportunity, to help in laying the foundations of a new Jewish life in a Jewish land. The task of Zionism is to create that opportunity. As to the land that is to be the Jewish land there can be no question. Palestine alone, of all the countries on which the Jew has set foot throughout his long history, has an abiding place in his national tradition. It was in Palestine that the Jews lived as a nation and produced the highest fruits of their genius. The memory and the hope of Palestine have been bound up with the national consciousness of the Jewish people through all the centuries of exile, and have been among the most powerful forces making for the preservation of Jewry and of Judaism. The task of Zionism, then, is to create a home for the Jewish people in Palestine ; to make it possible for large numbers of Jews to settle there and live under conditions in which they can produce a type of life corresponding to the character and ideals of the Jewish people. When the aim of Zionism is accomplished, Palestine will be the home of the Jewish people, not because it will contain all the Jews in the world (that is impossible), but because it will be the centre to which all Jews will look as the home and the source of all that is most essentially Jewish. Palestine will be the country in which Jews are to be found, just as Ireland is the country

in which Irishmen are to be found, though there are more Irishmen outside Ireland than in it. And similarly Palestine will be the home of Judaism, not because there will be no Judaism anywhere else, but because in Palestine the Jewish spirit will have free play, and there the Jewish mind and character will express themselves as they can nowhere else.

Such is in outline the Jewish problem as Zionists see it, and such is the Zionist solution. In one form or another the idea of a national return to Palestine has been an active force in Jewish life for quite half-a-century, and it is therefore much older than the modern Zionist movement, which was founded by Dr. Theodor Herzl in 1896. But it is in the Zionist movement that the idea has taken most practical and permanent shape, and come most prominently before the world, and the idea is therefore rightly associated with the name of Zionism. A complete account of the Zionist movement, of its history, its organisation, its institutions, and its achievements, would be out of place here.* For the present purpose it will suffice to set forth the aims of the movement as formulated in its programme, and to indicate briefly the steps which have been taken to put theory into practice.

The programme of the Zionist movement was laid down at the first Congress, at Basle, in 1897, and is known as the “Basle Programme.” The first article of the Basle Programme, which is a general statement of aim, runs as follows:—

“Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by legal guarantees.”

The programme was originally formulated in German, and the phrase translated above “secured by legal guarantees”—*öffentlich-rechtlich gesichert*—cannot be exactly rendered in English,† because of the difference between English and German legal conceptions. The distinction between *öffent-*

* The various aspects of the subject are treated in later pamphlets in this series.

† It should be superfluous to point out that the English translation which is—or used to be—current—“a publicly-legally assured home”—is quite meaningless, and is not even English. Another version is “publicly recognised, legally secured”; but this makes no real attempt to reproduce the sense of the original.

liches Recht and *privat-Recht* is one that does not exist in English law; and though *öffentliches Recht* may be rendered by “public law,” the use of the word “public” does not give the term any precise meaning. What the framers of the programme meant, in effect, was that there was to be some sort of guarantee for the Jewish settlement in Palestine, a guarantee given to the Zionist organisation, or to the Jewish people, as a body, over and above the implied guarantee of rights which the individual resident in a country has as an individual. The precise form of the guarantee was not defined. In the early years of Zionism most people thought of a Jewish State under international guarantees, or of a charter from the Turkish government with the guarantee of the European Powers for its observance. But later, and especially after the Turkish revolution of 1908, this idea fell into the background, and, while Jewish life in Palestine was visibly growing from year to year, and the Jewish settlement suffered no molestation at the hands of the Turkish government, the question of guarantees, international or otherwise, ceased to trouble Zionists to any extent. To this point, however, we shall have to return later in dealing with the means by which the Zionist movement strove to attain its aim.

These means are thus formulated in the Basle Programme :—

1. The promotion by appropriate means of the settlement in Palestine of Jewish agriculturists, artisans, and manufacturers.

2. The organisation and binding together of the whole of Jewry by means of suitable institutions, both local and international, in accordance with the laws of each country.

3. The strengthening of the Jewish national feeling and national consciousness.

4. By way of preparation, steps towards obtaining the consent of Governments, where necessary, in order to reach the goal of Zionism.

Briefly, these four branches of Zionist work may be summarised as follows: first, the colonisation and development of

Palestine ; secondly, the cementing of the scattered sections of Jewry ; thirdly, the strengthening of the Jewish national consciousness ; and fourthly, the enlistment of the sympathy and assistance of powerful nations.

It is obvious that these four methods of activity do not all stand in the same relation to the aim of Zionism. Two of them—the first and the third—are direct means of promoting the end in view ; the other two are indirect. That is to say, all that the aim of Zionism demands is, first, that conditions favourable to the rebirth of Jewish national life shall be created in Palestine, and secondly, that the right attitude of mind shall be cultivated among the Jews throughout the world, so that numbers of them will be willing to become pioneers in the work of building up a Jewish life in the country. To bring into closer connection the different bodies of Jews scattered over the globe, and to obtain recognition and assistance from the nations—these are subsidiary measures ; and the possibility of carrying them out in practice depends entirely on the progress made in colonising Palestine and in reviving the Jewish consciousness. For only those Jews in whom the Jewish consciousness has been awakened will join a world-wide organisation of Jewry ; and the extent to which Zionism can become a political force, capable of winning the sympathy and the active support of governments, must be determined entirely by the strength of the Jewish holding in Palestine on the one hand, and the strength of the desire of the Jews for Palestine on the other hand.

In practice the kind of work which holds the second place in the programme—the organisation and knitting together of the scattered bodies of Jews—has resolved itself into the formation in all Jewish centres throughout the world of Zionist Societies, which are grouped in local Federations, and through the local Federations in the Zionist Organisation. The aim of uniting all Jews in the organisation has not been realised. But the number of shekel-payers (the shekel is the symbol of membership of the organisation) has risen to something

approaching 200,000—a number which is very considerable in view of the difficulties involved in organising groups of individuals spread over the whole world and speaking all the languages under the sun. And the effect of the Zionist idea on Jewish life is not wholly to be measured by the number of professed adherents of the movement. Large numbers of Jews in every country have shown practical sympathy with Zionist aims, though they have not entered the organisation.

The other indirect means to the Zionist end—that of winning the sympathy and support of the nations—played a large part in the early history of the movement. It was regarded by Dr. Herzl as a cardinal point in his programme. Approaching the Jewish problem as he did at a time when Turkey was “the sick man,” and when the break-up of the Ottoman Empire seemed imminent, he not unnaturally thought that there could be no hope of security for the Jewish settlement in Palestine unless it were established under a charter signed and sealed by the European Powers. Hence he devoted a large part of his energies to negotiating not alone with the Sultan, but with the rulers of Western countries as well. This particular form of activity had its most splendid triumph in the offer by the British Government of a territory in East Africa for a large autonomous settlement of Jews. But the masses of Zionists would have nothing to say to a settlement outside Palestine; and the most important effect of the East African scheme was to produce a strong reaction in favour of immediate practical work in the country which was admitted on all hands to be the ultimate goal of the movement. Circumstances conspired to strengthen this tendency, and to throw diplomatic activity into the background. The death of Dr. Herzl, in July, 1904, robbed the movement of the leader whose gifts and genius fitted him pre-eminently for diplomatic activity. And later, the whole situation was changed by the Turkish revolution, which gave the Ottoman Empire free institutions and representative government. In face of the new *régime* in

Turkey, the need for a charter could no longer be maintained, and the sphere of diplomatic activity was much reduced. This combination of causes—the reaction against East Africa, the death of Dr. Herzl, and the Turkish revolution—led to a greater concentration of Zionist effort on those lines of activity which we have called direct means to the end—on the work of colonisation in Palestine, and on the strengthening of the national consciousness outside Palestine.

It is not the purpose of this essay to sketch even in outline the progress which Zionism has made along these two lines of activity. It may suffice to say that under the influence of the movement, direct or indirect, there have grown up in Palestine the beginning of a new Jewish life—small beginnings as yet, but full of promise for the future. In Palestine to-day there are Jews settled on the soil and in the towns whose national consciousness is Jewish and whose language is Hebrew. The ideal of the return to the land of Palestine, as the home of the Jewish people, has begun to take concrete shape. And concurrently with this development, and partly as a result of it, there has gradually come about a change in the outlook of Jews—a change which can be more easily felt by those who are in touch with Jewish affairs than it can be measured by facts and figures. There are still far too many Jews in whom the Jewish consciousness—the sense of belonging to the Jewish people and sharing its hopes—has not been awakened. But the national idea has begun to affect spheres of Jewish life in which a generation ago the drift towards assimilation was the only visible movement; and its influence will grow with the growth of its concrete embodiment in Palestine.

It will be apparent from what has been said that Zionist activity has taken different forms in different periods. That is natural enough. The goal is one, but the roads are many, and the choice of road must be dictated by circumstances. What is essential is a clear conception of the goal, a clear understanding of the problem which Zionism sets out to solve and of the way in which it can be solved. Nothing but confusion

can be caused by an attempt to represent Palestine as an immediate remedy for all the ills under which individual Jews or bodies of Jews suffer. Zionism does not hold out a prospect of a sudden and miraculous "ingathering of the exiles." There must always be Jews in exile—outside Palestine—so long as the human mind can foresee. But when Jewish life is firmly established in Palestine, and Palestine has become the recognised centre of Jewry, the Jewish people and Judaism will no longer be in exile. That is what Zionism sets out to accomplish, and what it has begun to accomplish. To improve the conditions and relieve the misery of individual Jews is the work of other agencies. Zionism does not belittle the importance of such work. But the national need transcends the immediate needs of individuals; and Zionism, because its concern is with the supreme national need, claims to be more vital to the Jewish people than any philanthropic organisation can be. It does not combat philanthropic effort, but it does combat the idea that as between the Jews of the West and those of the East the proper relation is that of bestower and receiver. It rejects the notion, so natural to the English Jew, that our "foreign coreligionists" require help from us and can give us nothing. It recognises that it is these "foreign coreligionists" who have borne the brunt of the battle, and have preserved Judaism and the Jewish consciousness and faith in the Jewish future under intolerable conditions of life; whereas their would-be benefactors are giving up all that could make the long agony worth while. It sees the supreme task of Jews not in doling out material aid to the poor and the persecuted—however necessary and valuable such work may be—but in staying the disruptive forces which threaten the very existence of Jews and of Judaism. That task can be accomplished by no philanthropist, be he never so wealthy and so generous. It demands the united effort of all those Jews, be they rich or poor, in whom the consciousness of being Jews—of being the heirs of the Jewish tradition and of having the responsibility for its preservation—is still a

living force. It is a task to which no man can set his hand in the right spirit if he thinks that he is working for others. Every man must work for himself and for the nation, for himself as a member of the nation in idea, if not in fact. Only if he has that ideal attachment to the nation can he help to create the possibility of an actual attachment, for himself or for his children. Just as "every Jew should regard himself as having taken part in the exodus from Egypt," so should every Jew regard himself as a participant in the national regeneration which is yet to come. It must be something vital to himself as a Jew. That is the key to the Zionist attitude of mind, and the measure of its difference from the philanthropic attitude.

Jewish philanthropists may alleviate the lot of individual Jews or groups of Jews who are less happily situated than themselves. But to create a home for the Jewish people, to transform "the Jewish people" from an abstraction into a reality, and to make the Jewish spirit once more a living and productive force: that is an aim which demands the heart and soul of every Jew who prefers life to death. And that is the aim of Zionism.



Zionism and Jewish Culture.

IT is said to have much exercised the philosophical schools of the Middle Ages whether the egg was created before the chicken, or the chicken before the egg. Similarly, we may imagine, the future historians of the Jewish people will be much exercised to know whether the movement for the Renaissance of Jewish culture preceded Zionism, or sprang out of it. In truth they are two aspects of one idea, correlative to each other as much as the convex and concave sides of a mirror; both are the expression of the Jewish national consciousness, and both have as their aim to preserve the individuality and restore the influence of the Jewish people.

It will be as well, in the first place, to explain as clearly as possible what is meant by Jewish culture; for it is one of those compendious catchwords which sound very well in an address, but are awkward to define, and consequently have become vague in their connotation. Culture, indeed, has acquired a specialised sense in the English language as the higher learning, and the more lofty kind of thought; and in this sense it has obtained a somewhat disparaging association among a people which is essentially practical. Bright spoke of it contemptuously as "a smattering of the two dead languages," and Mr. Frederic Harrison called it "a desirable quality in a critic of new books." We are not quite sure that, by reason of a false analogy with culture in the English sense, something of the same disparaging association does not cling about the phrase "Jewish Culture" in this country. But Jewish culture is not a higher kind of Jewish learning, or a

special preserve of the scholars and the educated class. It is the whole intellectual and spiritual expression of the Jewish people:—the fund of ideas and ideals which it has created during its long life, its outlook on the world, its literature of all ages, its history in the past, its hope in the future. The total product of the Jewish spirit, that is Jewish Culture. Its two basic foundations are the Bible and the Hebrew language: the first, the depository of its profoundest conceptions and its fundamental teachings, the other the permanent instrument of its thought. Upon these two foundations there has been erected almost the whole of our spiritual heritage:—the religious ordering of life with its elaborate system of law as developed in the Mishnah, the Talmud, and the Mediæval Codes, and its wealth of ceremonial and observance woven into daily conduct, which have together moulded Jewish character for generations, giving to it its special qualities and a definite bent; the moral and ethical teaching and the philosophy and fancy, which have sprung from the thought of its wise men in different ages, and are contained in the apocryphal and apocalyptic writings, the collections of Agadah and Midrash, the Hellenistic-Jewish literature of the Spanish period, the mysticism of the Kabbalah, and the modern Jewish learning of the last century; the record of its struggles to preserve its individuality through the ages, which is written in its tragic history of two thousand years, and is burnt into the inner soul of the nation; lastly, the statement of its aspirations and ideals, which is partly to be found in its prayers, partly in the movements that stirred it in former epochs, and partly in the movements and impulses that stir it to-day.

In the culture of most other historical nations we include a specific development of art, of architecture and building, of painting and sculpture, of music and drama. But Jewish culture, owing to the unique circumstances of its growth, has no corresponding development worthy of note. The Jewish spirit has found no permanent expression save in life and in literature; and even the greater part of its literary tradition is innocent of art. But what it lacks in variety and formal beauty, Jewish culture makes up in spiritual depth and

intensity. It is the thought of a people which, through a history longer than that of any other people, has been devoted to a peculiar idea of God and of human life and has preserved and developed that idea with a zeal and loyalty unparalleled, and under a sustained trial such as no other people has suffered.

The faith of the Congregation of Israel in former ages, and of those who resist assimilation to-day, is that these ideas and this outlook are still good, true and precious, and that they have still a supreme value for us and for humanity at large. It is the desire to make them again a living and creative influence among ourselves, and also, it may be, in a larger sphere, as they were in the days of our national existence, which has led to the Renaissance of Jewish culture, and is one of the deeper underlying motives of the national revival. In this essay we are primarily concerned not with the details of the revival but with its inter-connection with the movement to re-establish the Jewish nationality in its old home; but something must be said, by way of prelude, about the conditions which led up to both the cultural Renaissance and the National awakening.

When the French Revolution opened a new era of emancipation for the Jews of Central Europe, and Napoleon broke down the walls of the Mediæval Ghetto, a violent tendency towards assimilation asserted itself. As when he came into contact with Greek culture after Alexander's conquests, so now, when he was admitted into the world of European culture, the Jew was at first seized with a contempt for his own heritage and a passion for the ideas of other peoples. All that was Jewish seemed narrow, and what was non-Jewish was enlightenment. As Dubnow has put it, the password of the day was "Out of the national into the human." Not only were the Jews profoundly affected by the general cosmopolitan movement in thought, but utilitarian reasons were added in their case to augment the centrifugal force. The abandonment of their distinctive national outlook and their national culture seemed to be a necessary part of the price of their political and social emancipation. In order to be good French and German citizens, they must adopt French and German ways of life, and be Jews only in religious creed.

They repeated in each country the words of the Paris Sanhedrin: "Nationally speaking, we belong to our immediate surroundings: there is no Jewish nation: there are Germans, Frenchmen, and Englishmen confessing the Jewish religion."

The tendency to reduce Judaism from a culture to a creed, which was started by Moses Mendelssohn (who nevertheless himself retained a genuine feeling for Jewish life and thought) was carried to its extreme extent by his followers, who possessed neither his intellect, nor his virtues, nor his training. It is true that following his work of writing the Hebrew Bible Commentary, the "Biur," a German school, known as the Meassefim, developed in a periodical literature new themes and a new style, treating of the ideas of their new culture in the national language. But this revival of Hebrew was more sentimental than real, and was the work of dilettanti rather than of enthusiasts. And it did little or nothing to prevent the rush towards apostasy and absorption. The more solid and genuine attempt to bring modern thought into touch with Jewish tradition and the Hebrew language arose in a country where the Jewish spirit was stronger than it was in the Germany of the Mendelssohnian period. In Galicia, the *Haskalah* movement, which aimed at bringing enlightenment to the Jew through Jewish means, was inaugurated by the writings of Krochmal and Rappoport; and it was their pupils, Zunz and Fränkel, who brought back to Germany a new appreciation for Jewish culture, which had a deeper root in the past than the outpourings of the followers of Mendelssohn. But this later German School of Jewish learning was, on the other hand, more concerned with the history than the present development of Jewish culture; Judaism was for it a science, which merited the special study of Jews, but was detached to some extent from modern life. Zunz, indeed, hoped by appealing to the historical consciousness of his people to regain their love for their ancestral faith and literature, and by revealing the beauties of Jewish literature and the tragedy of Jewish history to arouse the sympathy of the Germans for their fellow-citizens. He aspired also to establish a "Science of Judaism" which should take its place at the Universities as a recognised department of study. But, as Mr. Segal has

well shown*, these various objects could not be successfully pursued together, and in the result none of them was achieved.

While the archæological and historical treatment of Judaism failed to win back the western Jews to national consciousness, a more living movement was working to bring about a regeneration of Jewish life in the East. The light of Western civilisation gradually filtered into the darkness of the Russian Pale of Settlement, and meeting there with a stronger Jewish consciousness than existed in Germany, it did not prove so destructive of Judaism. At the same time, its work here, too, was partly negative. Jewish culture and Judaism in the Ghetto had become by repression remote from modern life and modern thought, and overloaded with prescriptions and regulations. The new generation of *Maskilim* or Humanists, who developed the *Haskalah*, sought, on the one hand, to clear away this overgrowth and to introduce a more progressive spirit into the religion, on the other to develop the modern forms of literature, and to introduce the ideas of Western Europe in the Hebrew language. Much of their thought was erude and superficial, and much of their writing possessed little literary merit; but at least Hebrew to them was a living language, not an interesting survival; Jewish literature was the expression of a living people, not the record of bygone generations: and Jewish religion was the practice of a living organism, not the outworn tradition of past ages. Their work, therefore, had in it the breath of life, and while the German school appealed primarily to the student and the scholar, Lebensohn, Mapu, Schulman, and Gordon created a new Hebrew literature which became a lasting influence on the masses of the people.

The revival of Jewish culture had not at first an immediate and obvious association with the aspiration for a national restoration. It is true that the love of Zion is a leading motive with the pioneers of the new Hebrew; but it was not till the reerudescence of bitter anti-Jewish feeling in the seventies and eighties came to arouse the people from their belief in the advent of a cosmopolitan Millenium and the age of universal

* "Aspects of the Hebrew Genius" (Routledge 1910), p. 195.

equality and fraternity (which they had cherished for over half a century in spite of most glaring facts) that a clear national consciousness inspired the writers. The Jewish awakening, which was produced by the anti-Semitic outbursts in Germany and by the more brutal persecutions in Russia, gave a great impulse to the latent national yearning of the people. That yearning found a double expression in literature, which has continued to our day. On the one side are the Jewish writers, who, with their ideas rooted in European culture, reasoned out the logical necessity for the Jews to be a separate people. On the other side are the Hebrew writers, who, with their thought rooted in Jewish culture, called on their brethren to realise the national hope of the return to Zion. Like the ancient *Tannaim*, the great Rabbis who gave varying expression to the Jewish spirit in the first two centuries of the common era, so the contemporary pioneers of the Jewish National movement gave varying expressions to the cry of their people for the resettlement in Palestine.

In the first generation we have Kalischer and Hess; the first a religious enthusiast, burning with ardent belief in the fulfilment of prophecy, who by his "Drishat Zion" roused the Alliance Israelite to found the first Jewish agricultural school in Palestine, the Mikveh Israel; the second, a historical philosopher impelled by a scientific conviction of the essential individuality of his people, who, in his "Rome and Jerusalem," laid down some of the fundamental principles of Jewish Nationalism. In Russia, we have a little later Smolenskin and Pinsker, the one, in his Hebrew monthly, *Hashachar*, proclaiming the need for re-establishing the spiritual bond of the Jewish people and making their common language again a living force, and voicing also the need for the return to Palestine, so that the land may become a centre for that culture which can be expressed only in Hebrew; the other, roused by the terrible massacres in 1881 to set before the people in an impassioned pamphlet, *Auto-Emanzipation*, a solution for the international Jewish problem by the restoration of the nation somewhere in the world, and working for the colonisation of Palestine, rather because on that land alone could he focus Jewish national feeling, than because he himself

felt the necessity of its historical and spiritual association. Coming to our own times, we have a similar contrast in Achad Ha'am and Herzl. Achad Ha'am, pointing to the inner servitude which has followed the outward freedom of the emancipation, strives to arouse in his people a new spirit, and insists that in Palestine alone can the spiritual regeneration of Judaism take place. Herzl, awakened like Pinsker to a full Jewish consciousness by the brutal shock of anti-Semitic hatred and the conviction that the Jew cannot receive equality and free scope in Western Europe, turning to his people with the appeal that being a nationality they should make themselves a nation, and like Pinsker again, discerning their passion for their ancestral land, devoting his life to the heroic endeavour to secure for them a legally-assured home in Palestine. The contrast between the two aspects of the Jewish national movement is striking. On the one side, as we have seen, are those who are concerned primarily with the problem of Judaism; on the other, those who are moved by the problem of the Jew: these most affected by the spiritual degeneration of their people, those by their economic and social disabilities; these appealing to them in the national language, Hebrew, those in the adopted language of the environment in which they happen to live.

But if among the pioneers and leaders there was a fundamental difference of emphasis on the objective of the National movement, their ideals have been, in the process of time, combined within the movement itself. Both spiritual and political Zionists—to give them the names by which they were distinguished—looked for the realisation of their aims in the resettlement of Palestine; and they could work together whole-heartedly for this common goal. Palestine was the all-powerful magnet which attracted every force for the regeneration of the Jewish people. There was, too, another common bond between the two sections, in their opposition to the assimilationist tendencies of the Jewish communities in the Diaspora, which regarded the whole of Judaism, save its monotheistic creed, as sordid or obsolete or both, and proceeded to get rid of it sometimes by gradual so-called reforming stages, sometimes by more radical measures.

Whether with a view to preserving Judaism or to saving the Jews from extinction, it was necessary to set up a counter-acting force to this centrifugal self-despising movement; and that force could be found mainly in the encouragement of Jewish culture. From its inception, then, the Zionist movement has embraced as part of its programme the revival of the Jewish consciousness—and that in two directions: by the re-establishment of a Jewish system of education and a Jewish national life in Palestine, and by the endeavour to stimulate the spread of the Hebrew language and the knowledge of Jewish history and literature, and generally to revive the national consciousness, in the communities of the Diaspora.

It is this double movement which we have to describe in some further detail. But in the first place a few words may be said of the place which Jewish culture has occupied in the official Zionist organisation. In the early Congresses it was a notorious apple of discord, and it had for a time to be eliminated from the programme of discussion, because of the fierce passions that centred around it. This trouble was caused partly by the dislike of the active political party for what they treated as the fantasies of academic theorists, and partly also by the destructive tendencies which marked the writings of many of the exponents of Jewish culture, and which were bitterly resented and dreaded by the orthodox upholders of Jewish tradition. The standpoint of certain extremists indeed gave some reason to fear that the Jewish culture which they desired was to be entirely divorced from the Torah; for such a revival, or rather reversal, of Judaism the religious party could have no sympathy. But though there has remained some misgiving between the two sections—which was illustrated not very long ago by the protest of the Misraehi group against the introduction in the programme of the Tenth Congress of the topics of Hebrew education and Hebrew literature—and though there still lurks a feeling that Jewish Culture is a pretty euphemism for heterodoxy, and the word itself an invention of the Epikouros, the antagonism has largely died away under the influence of a clearer understanding; and all sections are now agreed in regarding the spiritual revival in Palestine as one of the outstanding aims

of the movement. Recognition of the place of the Hebrew speech in the Zionist ideal was shown at the Eighth Congress, when it was resolved that Hebrew should be the official language of the movement. Since then, the use of Hebrew has grown from Congress to Congress,

Turning now to the steps which, under the influence of the National movement, have been taken in the Diaspora to foster Jewish culture, the most notable and the most important is the endeavour to make Hebrew a living and spoken language. The re-creation of the national spirit can clearly be served by nothing better than by the strengthening of one of the great national bonds which have held us together. It is true that the thorough revival of Hebrew requires a regular system of education in and through that language; and that in the countries where the Ghetto still exists the feeling of suspicion towards the new Hebrew culture and its exponents induces an opposition to the substitution of the national for the *Galuth* language, Yiddish, as the vehicle of instruction; while in the lands where the Ghetto has broken down, the admission of the Jewish child to the secular State school and the regular use of the native tongue make Hebrew a secondary, often a tertiary language, and Hebrew education, even where conducted according to the "natural method," a truncated and incomplete thing. But in spite of these obstacles the progress of Hebrew is more marked year by year even in the West. It shows itself in the foundation of Talmud Torahs employing the *Ibrith B'Ibrith* method, and of a smaller number of regular Hebrew day-schools where a modern education is given in that language; the establishment of societies of adults for Hebrew speaking; the holding of conferences for the same object; the publication of Hebrew books for the instruction and edification of the young; the growth of a modern Hebrew literature embracing every form of literary art, and counting writers such as Byalik and Aehad Ha'am, who for style, as well as for thought, rank among the great writers of the day; and lastly in the organisations of a Hebrew press comprising journals and reviews such as *Hazephirah*, *Hashiloach*, and *Ha'olam*, which may take their place among the best of their class in Europe.

Side by side with the revival of Hebrew there goes the endeavour to arouse the national consciousness among the weaker but more numerous brethren, who have little or no Hebrew, by a Jewish literature in the European languages. In part this literature consists of translations of the Hebrew masterpieces of our Renaissance, in part of books of reference, of which the most striking example is the Jewish Encyclopædia ; but it can also point to a number of original works, many of which have in time obtained translation into Hebrew. As examples of the variety of this so-to-say exotic Jewish literature, we may mention the Yiddish poems of Shalom Aleichem, and the English poems of Emma Lazarus, the *tendenz*-novel of Herzl, *Altneuland*, the romantic biographies of Zangwill in "The Dreamers of the Ghetto," the Yiddish novels and stories of Perez and Frug, the Jewish History of Dubnow, the Essays of Sechechter and James Darmesteter and, in a very different manner, of Nordau.

In every country there has been a quickening of the Jewish spirit, showing itself in the renewal of the study of Jewish achievements and in the outbursts of a literary activity directly prompted by the national feeling. In every country, too, where there is an organised Jewish community, there has appeared a periodical literature designed to foster and subserve that cause. One other factor should be mentioned, though it is as yet poor as a form of art, and not very happy as a cultural influence—the Jewish Theatre, which chooses its subjects largely from the ideas or the personalities dear to the national consciousness.

It may seem surprising that the national movement has not yet produced in the Diaspora any distinct movement in the synagogue, the depository of the traditional religion which is the most vital part of Jewish culture. It has, indeed, brought back a number of individuals to some religious tie ; it caused some of the leaders of the *Haskalah* to return to the observance of Judaism as a national way of life ; but it has not hitherto led to the promotion of a religious revival which should give expression to the national side of Judaism, while setting it free from the overgrowth of regulation that had clung to it when the Jewish people were cut off from

outside thought. The reason is partly to be found in the fact that Zionism offers a broader basis to the Jewish people than religion alone, and that its non-religious aspects were naturally the first to be developed; partly also in the difficulty of interfering in any way with religious practice and belief, round which there are always gathered at once the most conservative and the most iconoclastic zeal, and the most uncompromising sentiment. But the task of reviving the Jewish religion under the influence of the new national awakening, and of interweaving it anew into the life of the Jewish people in such a way as to bind them together without interfering with liberty of thought or repelling their reason—this remains the most difficult work of the Renaissance in this and the future generations. It may be that it cannot be faced till we have that settlement of Jewish life in Palestine at the development of which we have now to glance.*

We find there the same manifestations of the revival of Jewish culture as in the countries of the Dispersion, but in some respects to a much intenser and more striking degree. Above all, Hebrew has had more chance there to become the natural language of a settled people. The idealistic spirit, which had urged its adoption in the Jewish schools of Europe, was reinforced in Palestine by a practical necessity. The Jewish communities in the towns at the end of the nineteenth century were in their variegated character microcosms of the Jewish people. There were Sephardim, descendants of long settled ancestors or of refugees from the Peninsula, who spoke the Ladino dialect which had been brought from Spain; there were Yemenites who spoke Arabic; there were Russians, Galicians, Rumanians, and Germans speaking the Yiddish jargon in one of its many forms, and there were Persians and Bokharans who spoke an Arabic-Jewish dialect. Lastly, there was a section of the children and of the younger generation who had been educated at the European schools established under the auspices of the *Alliance Israélite*, the *Hilfsverein* and the *Anglo-Jewish Association*, and who spoke French, German, or English according to the nationality

* A detailed account of the revival of Jewish culture in Palestine is reserved for another pamphlet in this series.

of the institution which they had attended. For it had been the curious design of the Jewish bodies which had regard to the welfare of the Palestinian population to make their Jewish foundations in the Holy Land outposts of the interests and the language of the countries in which they were located, and to fit the Palestinian children rather for emigration to Europe or America than for membership of a Palestinian community. But the rapid growth and the extraordinary variety of the Jewish settlement which has entered the land during the last twenty years emphasised the need for a common language of instruction, and the growth of the national spirit ensured that Hebrew should be the language. Thus, while Yiddish still remains dominant in the old-style Chedarim and a section of the Talmud Torahs in the towns, in the agricultural colonies throughout the country and in all the more modern elementary and secondary schools of the cities, Hebrew has become the vehicle of education, and by this means is establishing itself as the mother-tongue of the younger generation. A noteworthy sign of the place which Hebrew has now won is the fact that the European schools in Palestine—with the exception of those of the *Alliance*, which with pertinacious perversity opposes all that makes for the strengthening of the national consciousness—have made Hebrew the primary language and teach it as the language of speech. It is then fairly certain that the Jews of Palestine within a few generations will be a Hebrew-speaking community. Nor can it be doubted that, as the demand for teachers of Hebrew by the “natural method” increases in other Jewries, the Teachers’ Seminaries in Palestine will become a reservoir for them all, and a new meaning will be given to the Talmudic saying: “The speech of the people of Palestine is itself a Torah.”

Besides the schools, there are other indications of the expansion of Jewish culture in Palestine, where it has no indigenous culture to compete against, and is therefore more stimulated and encouraged than in Europe. Every Jewish centre and every large colony has its Beth-Am or popular club, where debates and lectures and social entertainments take place in the national language; several Hebrew papers

and periodicals are written and published in the country, not always very faithful to the traditional ideas of Judaism or even to its fundamental principles, but at least bearing witness to the general spread of the Hebrew knowledge. The more permanent forms of literature have their representatives in men like Yellin and Luncz and Ben-Yehuda; and Palestinian Jewry has given in Doctor Aronsohn at least one man who has taken a high place in the scientific investigation of the country.

In Palestine, as in the Diaspora, the Renaissance of Jewish culture has not yet led to a satisfactory grappling with the religious problem, and the two parties are ranged in opposing extreme attitudes. On the one side the upholders of the whole tradition in all its detail; on the other the repudiators of the whole, who claim that religion need not enter into the new life in the land. Neither party stands on firm ground, but the synthesis of their points of view which can only be attained by a profound understanding of the Jewish spirit in the past and the present, "true to the kindred points of Heaven and home," remains for this or a future generation to accomplish.

So much for the present. We have seen that, while in the Diaspora the re-awakening of the Jewish spirit has during the last few decades been steadily displayed, it is in Palestine that it has produced the healthiest and the most striking results. In Palestine, Jewish culture and the Hebrew language are fast becoming the normal language and culture of a people; there is being established a Jewish way of life and a Jewish adaptation of modern culture; and in a community which is gradually developing a full and many-sided activity, the Jewish element is dominant. Thus little by little the environment is being created from which there may be expected to spring a powerful Jewish influence and a creative imagination.

What the future has to bring forth it is always hazardous to say. But history warrants us in the conviction that no culture which influences humanity at large can be produced apart from a national environment. We cannot conceive Greek art and Greek thought, apart from the Greek city-State; the Renaissance of the fifteenth century, apart from the Italian

cities; the Elizabethan drama, apart from Elizabethan England; or, the spiritual teaching of the Bible, apart from the Judæan Kingdom. In the same way, then, there cannot be a vital and enduring revival of the Jewish spirit apart from a restored Jewish centre. History again warrants us in the conviction that nationalities like individuals have their proper function, which if they neglect, they degenerate and decay. And the study of our past and of the ideals and aspirations of our people in all times leads us to believe that the true Jewish function is spiritual teaching and the realisation of a spiritual conception of life. Nobody can say with honesty that the scattered Jewish communities are fulfilling that function to-day. But the faith that we have of being an *'Am 'Olam*, an eternal people, the faith which is part of Judaism and of Zionism, assures us that, given again the free environment and the opportunity of development, the old spiritual power will return and the national genius again be manifested. The Jewish spirit, as it has been said, would manifest itself in a new order founded on the old, purified and enriched by the experience which our greatest sons have gathered from the life of the ages. It is perhaps hardly necessary to add that the question of the political form which the Jewish national centre is to take becomes of subordinate importance when we regard Zionism from the point of view of Jewish culture. Even if there were a Jewish State in Palestine, we should have to apply to it the words that Ibsen used of Norway:—"States like ours cannot hold their own by material forces: but nations like ours can earn the right to exist by labouring for culture."

At the present moment, when the whole structure of civilisation appears to be threatened by the most terrible war in human history, it may seem Utopian to dream of the realisation of such an ideal. Palestine is itself involved in the world-struggle, and none can say to-day what will be the effect of the war either on the solid foundations of Jewish culture which have already been laid, or on the possibility of continuing the work on the old lines. But the Jewish people has learnt in the school of endurance to take a long view, and the ideals of social righteousness and the brotherhood of

nations, which are of the very essence of Jewish culture, and have been upheld through centuries of exile and suffering are not to be forgotten because their voice is temporarily drowned in the clash of arms. Rather is it the business of the Jew to keep a firmer hold on his national ideals, believing that the striving towards their realisation will not only preserve the Jewish nation, but will help to lead the world along the line of true progress. From this point of view the insistence on Jewish culture and on the need for its revival in its ancient home is even specially appropriate at the present time. And though the immediate future is entirely uncertain, there is yet some ground for hoping that the political changes due to the war will have the effect of giving the Jewish people a more splendid opportunity than it has had since the dispersion, of pursuing its natural work in the old Jewish land.

In a beautiful dream of the progress of the pure Zionist ideal, which looks for the revival of the Jewish spirit in the ancestral land of the Jewish people, Achad Ha'am has foretold how gradually Palestine becomes the educational and spiritual centre of all Jewry, how children come to its schools, and young men to its universities, from Jewish communities all the world over: how they carry back with them a fertilising influence to invigorate the communities of the Diaspora, and how by this stream, from the fountain of living waters, the Jewish spirit everywhere is fortified, and becomes an active and conscious power. That dream is already in our day beginning to be a working reality: the movement towards the East has begun: the foundation of a Jewish culture in Palestine is being laid before our eyes. And when in the land of the Prophets, we have planted a people speaking the language of the Prophets and inspired by the ideals of the Prophets in their daily life, the work of the Renaissance and the aims of Zionism will be on their way together to fulfilment: Palestine will be a light to Israel, and Israel will be a light to the nations.

ZIONIST PAMPHLETS.

Edited by H. SACHER, LEON SIMON,
and S. LANDMAN.

This forms one of a series of ten pamphlets which will be issued at short intervals during the suspension of "The Zionist." The aim of the series is to inform the Jewish and Non-Jewish world as to the spirit, the objects, the machinery, and the achievements of Zionism. The following are the subjects and authors :—

- "ZIONISM AND THE JEWISH PROBLEM," by LEON SIMON.
(*Ready.*)
- "HISTORY OF ZIONISM," by S. LANDMAN. (*In the Press.*)
- "ZIONISM, ITS ORGANIZATION AND INSTITUTIONS,"
by S. LANDMAN.
- "JEWISH COLONISATION AND ENTERPRISE IN PALESTINE,"
by J. M. SIEFF.
- "HEBREW EDUCATION IN PALESTINE," by S. PHILLIPS.
- "A HEBREW UNIVERSITY FOR JERUSALEM," by H. SACHER.
- "ZIONISM AND THE JEWISH RELIGION," by F. S. SPIERS.
- "ZIONISM AND JEWISH CULTURE," by NORMAN BENTWICH.
(*Ready.*)
- "ZIONISM AND THE STATE," by H. SACHER.
- "PALESTINE AND THE HEBREW REVIVAL," by E. MILLER.

It is believed that a knowledge of the true facts will make Zionism appeal to a large number of people who have not had, or have not sought, the opportunity of knowing what Zionism means.

The subscription for the whole series is 2/6, post free. Special terms are allowed to secretaries of Societies. Subscriptions should be sent to the MANAGER OF "THE ZIONIST," 4, KING'S BENCH WALK, TEMPLE, LONDON, E.C.

History of Zionism.

ZIONISM as a solution of the Jewish Problem, though the term is only some twenty years old,* is in reality as old as the Jewish Problem, and has taken varying forms according to the manner in which the problem was viewed. Speaking generally, Zionism until 1897 meant the desire of the Jewish people to regain its old homeland and the possibility of renewed productive life in a normal and healthy environment. Since 1897 it has come to signify in addition a complex of well-defined institutions and a special organisation aiming at the practical carrying into effect of this desire. The founding of this organisation, the Zionist organisation, is the work of Dr. Theodor Herzl (1860-1904) the first and incomparably the greatest of Zionist leaders. The establishing of an organisation representative of the various Jewries in the world at a time when they were becoming more and more estranged from each other by reason of their increasing assimilation to their respective environments was a work of genius. Nevertheless, the ground had already been to some extent prepared for him by other influences and organisations.

It would take too long to give a complete history of the yearning for Zion and the attitude of the Jewish people towards Zion during the Diaspora. In brief, their attitude, after the early attempts to regain their land by armed force under Bar Coehba and others in the second and seventh centuries following the breakup of the Jewish State had proved futile, had changed first of all into an impatient expectation of a warrior leader who was certain to come to their help, then, under the influence of constant disappointment and the pressure of persecution, into a deep longing for and a firm belief in a Messiah who would deliver them by miraculous means. This yearning and this hope formed part of the religion and consequently of the life of every Jew until the dawn of modern times—the eighteenth century. The separateness of the Jews and their Jewish education preserved intact their love of Zion (*Chibbath Zion*) during the long centuries of their exile. Until emancipation broke down the walls of the ghetto in Western Europe and brought the breath of modern culture to the Jew, the history of the Zionist longing is simple and practically the same in all

* The word Zionism is said to have been first employed in 1894 by Birnbaum.

the Jewries of the world. From the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, we must consider separately Eastern and Western Jewry.

Emanicipation came first in the West and found the Jews very ill prepared to receive it. Instead of assimilating the culture of the nations among whom they lived, they absorbed it and became absorbed by it. The Jewries of England, France, and Germany were not sufficiently strong either numerically or in Jewish feeling and knowledge of Judaism to resist the intoxication of the wonderful new sense of freedom which emanipation brought them. The consequences are sufficiently well known; the whittling down of Judaism from a national religion to a faith or 'persuasion' which may be fitted on to the citizens of any country, the 'reform' of Judaism by ridding it of most of the qualities which distinguish it and make it peculiarly Jewish (good examples are the abolition of "Zion" and most of the Hebrew prayers from the liturgy and the attempt to do away with the Jewish Sabbath), in a word, the constant if unconscious effort to make Jews and Judaism indistinguishable from non-Jews and Christianity. This process might have reached its logical conclusion—the disappearance of Western Jewry—but for two obstacles. On the one hand the non-Jews, partly on account of the growth of nationalism and its fungus Antisemitism in the nineteenth century, refused to take the Western Jews to their hearts and treat them as brothers and equals, on the other, a wave of *Jewish* nationalism gathered strength among the East European Jews—the Jewish and non-assimilated Jews—some of whom refused or were unable to imitate their Western brethren, and the best among whom concentrated their attention on the need of saving the spirit of Judaism by finding a home for its persecuted body. The stream of emigrants from East to West kept the West from losing entirely its contact with Jewish national feeling.

The Eastern Jews among whom this Movement of *Chibbath Zion* arose were principally the Jews in Russia and Austria, most of whom had preserved their Jewishness much more successfully than the Western Jews. Chiefly because they had retained the traditional Jewish Education they had been able to keep burning the torch of Jewish learning and Jewish hope when it was almost extinguished among other Jewries. The influence upon the best Eastern Jews of modern culture, instead of estranging them from their people, induced them on the contrary to bring the new learning and new ideas to their people. This is seen in the *Haskalah* (or new learning) movement. The leaders of this movement, Krochmal, the two Lebensohns, Zederbaum, Perez Smolenskin, M. A. Ginzburg, J. L. Gordon, Moses Leib Lilienblum, tried to introduce freedom of thought, and tolerance, and other great

qualities which they saw in modern culture, into the minds of Ghetto Jewry. For a short time the leaders of the *Haskalah* movement fell, like the Western Jews, into the error of thinking that emancipation of itself would save Jews and Judaism. The pogroms of the eighties, however, and the relentless persecution of the Jews by the Russian bureaucracy revealed to them in the clearest manner their naive error, and taught them that Russia could never be their spiritual home, though, unfortunately, it might have to be their material home for many years to come. They realised also that their spiritual home had never ceased to be Zion, and that the only way to regain Zion was to colonise it and make it a material home for at least some of their brethren. These ideas formed the platform first of the *Bilu*, a society of pioneer colonists founded in January, 1882, and later of the *Choveve Zion* (Lovers of Zion) established in 1884 (after a conference at Kattowitz) by Dr. Pinsker, Lilienblum, Rabbi Mohilewer, S. P. Rabinowicz, Jassinowsky, S. J. Finn, Lewanda, Wissotzki, and others. Some of the founders were also leaders of the *Haskalah* movement.

The attitude of Western Jewry towards the *Choveve Zion* was on the whole unfavourable. The feeling of horror aroused by the pogroms had, it is true, predisposed the Western Jews to open their hearts to any movement which could help their persecuted brethren. The other object of the *Choveve Zion*, however,—to nurse the wounded soul of Judaism back to health—they could not appreciate. Thus the efforts of Western Jews to help their Eastern brethren emanated from purely philanthropic motives. This explains why the millions of money spent by Baron Hirsch, and later by the Jewish Colonisation Association, went to Brazil instead of to Palestine. Later, the rich Jews in their attitude to Zionism proper again showed the blindness of their philanthropy and their opposition to any scheme which went beyond almsgiving on a smaller or larger scale. The only exception was Baron Edmond de Rothschild who understood the value of Palestine and helped the Jewish Colonies with a liberal hand. It is well known that the early colonies in Palestine could not have survived without his help.

Palestine had never been forgotten by the Eastern Jews, but in time they had grown to look upon it as a deserted land which could scarcely be reclaimed by merely human efforts. The first to speak and write of the colonisation of Palestine as a practical solution of the Jewish Problem was Zebi Hirsch Kalischer (1795-1874), rabbi of Thorn in Posen, whose work *Sefer Emunah Yesharah*, written in 1843, suggested that the Messianic idea did not necessarily involve the regaining of Palestine by a miracle, but that the efforts of the Jewish people were required to realise the idea. Similar ideas are to be found

in the works of another rabbi, Elias Guttmacher of Gratz. A pamphlet by Kalischer, *Derishat Ziyyon*, (published in 1862) definitely suggested the founding of a society for the colonisation of Palestine. Charles Netter, inspired by Kalischer's ideas, induced the Alliance Israelite Universelle to establish in 1870 the Mikveh Israel Agricultural School near Jaffa. Small settlements of Jewish Colonists had been established about the same time at Petach Tikvah and near the sea of Tiberias, the latter by Kalischer himself. These settlements were not successful, owing to the lack of proper preparation for the task on the part of the colonists. The Palestinian solution was advocated among Western Jews by *Moses Hess* (1812-1875) one of the early leaders of the Social Democratic movement in Germany. His attention, like that of many other Western Jews, had been called to the existence of a Jewish problem by the Damascus affair of 1840 (the Jews were accused of having murdered a Capuchin friar for ritual purposes). The journey of Sir Moses Montefiore, Adolphe Crémieux and Salomon Munk to Mehemet Ali to obtain redress had stirred the feelings and attracted the attention of all the Jewries of the world. In 1860, a similar accusation was made against Jews, also at Damascus, and once again the eyes of Jewry were turned towards the East. The Alliance Israelite Universelle was established in 1860 to safeguard the Jewish name from such calumnies and to act as an international Jewish body for the protection of persecuted Jews.

Hess explained his views in his book, *Rome and Jerusalem, the latest National Question*. (1862.) His thesis is, first, that Jews will always remain strangers in every country in which they are permitted to live, secondly, that the Jewish type of life and outlook is indestructible, and lastly, that, if emancipation should prove irreconcilable with Jewish National feeling, the latter should be kept and the much prized emancipation sacrificed. The views of Hess fell upon deaf ears among Western Jewry for reasons already made clear. Emancipation still appeared to them a wonderful jewel for which they were prepared to barter their soul. They still dreamed that they would have a place in the "brotherhood of man." The nationalist view was put even more clearly and courageously by Dr. Leo Pinsker (1821-1891) of Odessa, in his well-known pamphlet *Auto-emanzipation*. The chief merit of this work is the clearly stated view that Jews must help themselves. Neither miracles from above, nor the kindness of Gentiles, nor the progress of internationalism would solve the Jewish problem. They could only become a living nation by beginning to live (*i.e.*, to act) as a nation and strive for the realisation of their national aspirations. The author sketches an outline of the kind of action required, and has forecasted in many particulars the work of the Zionist organisation. Pinsker's idea

bears the stamp of having been called forth by the pogroms and by Antisemitism in the emphasis which it lays on the material solution, namely, the finding of a home—anywhere—for the oppressed Jews. Pinsker's message was taken up in Russia, and in a more Jewish form was preached by Ahad Ha'am (Asher Ginzberg, born 1856). The *Choveve Zion* movement spread from Russia into the other countries of Europe during the decade 1885-1895. The practical programme of the *Choveve Zion*, and later of the Odessa Committee, consisted in creating an office at Jaffa for the purchase and sale of land and to examine the legal ways and means by which the consent of the Turkish authorities could be obtained for the Jewish colonisation. At the suggestion of Ahad Ha'am, the most far-sighted and critical member of the Committee, important improvements were made in the administration of the colonies and the question of national education began to occupy the foremost position in their programme. By the year 1897 half-a-dozen colonies were being administered, agricultural dwellings had begun to be built, and libraries and schools subventioned. Thus the ground was prepared for the Zionist movement and the transition to a political organisation of the Jewish people.

In 1895, Dr. Theodor Herzl, a Western Jew, then living in Paris, sprung from an assimilated Viennese family, was led by his study of French Antisemitism, under the influence of the Nationalist ideas then current in Europe, to apply his mind to the Jewish problem as he conceived it. He was not acquainted with any of the works of a Zionist nature previously mentioned, but viewed the problem quite independently and arrived at the same or similar conclusions. Like Pinsker, Herzl in his *Judenstaat* starts from the position that the root cause of Antisemitism is the homelessness of the Jewish people, and that Antisemitism will never die unless and until the Jewish people regain a Jewish state—somewhere. Like Pinsker, again, but to an even greater degree, Herzl was estranged from general Jewish sentiment, so that he did not know the claim which Palestine had on the loyalty and affection of the Jewish people. His *Judenstaat*, published in 1896, is therefore in a sense rather the text book of Territorialism* than of Zionism. The Jewish problem, as it appeared to the author of the *Judenstaat*, was quite simple. The Jews are a nation who have not been destroyed by many centuries of persecution; they have the will to live, and the only way in which they can live properly and free from Antisemitism is by establishing an autonomous Jewish State. Herzl suggests the formation of a new organisation, "the Society of Jews," to make all the necessary preparations and investigations. Then a

* The Territorialist movement established 1905 by Israel Zangwill seeks a territory for Jews anywhere (*cf. p. 11 infra*).

“ Jewish Company ” should be established with a capital of fifty million pounds to carry into execution the programme of the Society. It is noteworthy that England was to be the headquarters of the Company. The work of the Company is to prepare the land for the new immigrants and to transport them. The land may be Argentine or Palestine, but the colonists must not be smuggled into it; they must come openly and be protected by international law and public guarantees. The desire for a homeland and the stimulus of the Rabbis, so Herzl imagined, would suffice to ensure a stream of colonists. The form of government should be an aristocratic republic. As Jews cannot speak Hebrew, there would be not one language but many, as in Switzerland. There should be perfect religious and political tolerance. Aliens should enjoy exactly the same rights as native-born subjects.

These ideas found no echo in the circle of his assimilated Viennese friends in which they were first announced. Their first result was to cut Herzl off from all but a trusty few of his friends and acquaintances, and to estrange him from his previous environment. Israel Zangwill drew attention to Herzl's ideas in England and procured for him an invitation to address the Maccabeans in July, 1896. Herzl opened a discussion of the Jewish question by a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* in the same month. During his visit to England he sounded the wealthy Jews but found them resolutely opposed to his views. He had already interviewed Baron Hirsch in 1895 without success, and to the last the wealthy Jews stood aloof. They were not, however, the only Jews who opposed the Zionist solution. The opposition came from all quarters, some scarcely to be expected.

The assimilated Western Jews were thoroughly frightened by the wide publicity which Herzl gave to the idea that Jews were a separate nation. For years they had been preaching and crying from the housetops that they were Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans of the Jewish persuasion. In time, by dint of repetition, they had come to believe it, and they thought their Gentile neighbours would accept their view. And now all their work would be undone by this terrible Zionism. Then the Orthodox Jews found Zionism impossible because the leaders were not observant Jews. They, the orthodox Jews, could not give their support to a movement which would—so they thought—sanction unobservance.* Lastly, most of the Jewish bourgeoisie was against Herzl's suggestions, partly because they considered the object unattainable and the scheme fantastic, but chiefly because they were comfortable and did not wish to be disturbed.

* Since then the observant Jews have formed a special section within the Zionist organisation under the name of the *Misrachi*.

But soon there began to gather round Herzl a band of intellectuals who, like Herzl himself, felt keenly the shame of Antisemitism and had too much pride to deny their race and faith by pretending they were identical with the people among whom they lived. Chief among them, was Max Nordau, who was Herzl's faithful colleague from the commencement, and whose advocacy of the movement was of the greatest service in making it widely known in the early years. The supporters of Herzl were of two classes. One was the young nationalists of Russia, Austria, and Rumania, and to a lesser extent Germany, the other, those whose interest in Palestine had been aroused by the *Choveve Zion*. At first Herzl had no thought of placing himself at the head of an organisation. It was the *Kadimah*—a society of Jewish nationalist students in Vienna—which invited him to carry into execution the scheme he had outlined in the *Judenstaat*. This request was supported by students' societies in other parts of Austria. A similar request and appreciation of his ideas came from the *Choveve Zion* pioneers settled in Palestine. Their letter is signed among others by Yellin, Ben Jehuda, Jahvitz and Pines. From Russia, Galicia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, came letters of cordial sympathy and promises of support and adhesion. These Jews were ready, even eager, to answer his call. But he found that their enthusiasm was not for Argentine or any other territory, but for Zion, and he therefore turned his attention to Palestine.

From this point until his death in 1904, the history of Zionism is the history of Herzl's efforts. He devoted all his means and all his energies to the movement. After a visit to Constantinople, during which he succeeded in obtaining several interviews with the Sultan, he saw that he must be able to offer large sums of money for land purchase—and he tried again to persuade the wealthy Jews of the practicability of his scheme. In England, he tried Lord Rothschild and Sir Samuel Montagu without success, in France he offered Baron Edmond de Rothschild the leadership of the movement, but without avail. The great Jewish philanthropic organisations—the *Alliance Israelite Universelle*, the *J.C.A.* (*i.e.*, Jewish Colonisation Association) who were the executors of Baron Hirsch, the *Allianz* of Vienna also refused to help him. But by the spring of 1897 interest had grown so considerably that Herzl decided to call a Congress of Zionists from all parts of the world in August of that year. The Jews of Munich, in which city the Congress was originally intended to meet, protested violently, and in the end Basle, in Switzerland, was selected in its place. "*Die Welt*" was established by Herzl (at his own expense) as the official organ of the movement in order to be able to reply in print to the opposition of the Jewish press of almost every country. The idea of a Jewish Congress

publicly discussing Jewish affairs before the eyes of the whole world was revolting to the official Jewish communities of Western Europe, and they prepared what they considered a crushing blow. The *Berliner Tageblatt* and other important German papers published a statement signed by the five leading Rabbis of Germany that the efforts of the 'so-called' Zionists were "contrary to Messianic prophecy and that Judaism imposes on all Jews the duty of loyalty to the fatherland to which they belong." This powerful protest, however, and other protests availed nothing against the determination of Herzl and his small band of helpers. Zionist societies were formed everywhere, public sympathy was aroused, and the Jewish papers began to come round to Herzl's side. The enthusiastic promises of support which showered in on Herzl at this time from all corners of the earth encouraged him in the conviction that the Congress would be a success. The first Zionist Congress met at Basle on August 29th, 1897. Jews from almost every country sent representatives (the number of delegates was about 200) and for the first time since the Exile an assembly was convened which could claim with some show of justice to be considered a national assembly. The enthusiasm at the Congress was boundless. Perfect strangers embraced one another with tears of joy, and the convener of the Congress was the object of endless ovations. All those present realised the historic moment through which they were passing.*

From the point of view of attracting the attention of the Jewish and non-Jewish world the Congresses were highly successful. The number of adherents (counted by the number who paid the *Shekel*, the minimum subscription to the organisation) grew tenfold in the three years between the first and the third Congresses. The non-Jewish press gave the Zionist idea great publicity, and some important English papers called for a European conference to consider the Jewish question. At this period the movement was very strong in England, and many of the most important Zionist institutions, including the Jewish Bank (The Jewish Colonial Trust Limited) and the Jewish National Fund, were established in London, which was also the venue of the Fourth Congress in 1900. The English Zionist Federation did yeoman service in furthering the political and financial activities of the movement. Thus

* There have been eleven Congresses in all, of which seven have been held in Basle. The Zionist programme, which is always referred to as the Basle programme, was settled at the first Congress. From the official report of the third Congress (Basle, 1899) we take the names of some of the leading Zionists in the principal countries in the early years of the movement. The Executive at Vienna consisted of Herzl, Kahn, Marmorek, Kokesch, Schnirer and Kremenetzky. The Vice-Presidents of the Congress were Dr. Gaster, Max Nordau and Mandelstamm. Chief among the Russian Zionists at that time were Mandelstamm, Temkin, Tschlenow, Ussischkin, Sokolow, Jacobson and Kohan Bernstein. York Steiner was chairman of the principal sub-committee of the Congress. Germany was represented on the Actions Committee by Wolffsohn, Bodenheimer, Rulf; France by Dr. A. Marmorek; America by Prof. Gottheil and Rev. Stephen Wise. The two English members were Dr. M. Umanski and Sir Francis Montefiore. Other English Zionists who took a prominent part in this Congress were Bentwich, De Haas, Cowen, Greenberg and Weizmann.

there seemed every ground for believing that Zionism had at one stride achieved that which seemed of the utmost importance to Herzl, viz., become a political movement and a world problem like other European political movements and other great world problems, and had gained the interest of all Jewries. Until 1902 or 1903 the movement made progress in this direction. It was not long, however, before both these aims were seen to be far from realised, and a period of depression followed the excessive enthusiasm of the early years. This depression was greatly increased by the unexpected death of Herzl in 1904, from which date a new phase of the movement commences.

As we look back on the evolution of Zionism from this point onwards, a remarkable phenomenon is revealed. We see the instrument created by Herzl for the purpose of acting in a certain way slowly but surely turning away to act in quite a different manner. Like some Galatea beneath the hand of a Pygmalion, so the Zionist organisation, graven as it was out of the living marble of *Chibbath Zion*, stepped down from its pedestal and took a direction never anticipated by Herzl. In order to understand the reason for this very curious happening it is necessary to explain the two different conceptions of Zionism which have coexisted in the movement from the beginning. The raw material of Zionism which Herzl found ready to his hand was quite different from Herzl's own Zionism. His Zionism, like that of many Western Zionists, was the product of Antisemitism only. The way in which Herzl and the early Congresses formulated the Jewish problem is, in effect, the following:—"As the Jews are a problem—almost a nuisance—to the nations of Europe, let them be given guarantees for a State of their own." The problem is thus a purely political one which could, theoretically at any rate, be solved by an independent Jewish State in any country. The raw material of the movement, however, the Jews whose roots were still deep in the soil of Judaism, could not regard Zionism as the political problem of relieving the nations of the world from an element which they disliked. To these Jews Zionism meant, above all, the regaining of the possibility—lost for so many centuries—of living and breathing freely as Jews attached to the soil of Palestine, the land whence their genius had come and whither it wished to return. This outlook, which is sometimes called 'Spiritual' Zionism, has found its finest expression in the works of Ahad Ha'am. It is fundamentally opposed to Herzl's political Zionism. Ahad Ha'am and the *Choveve Zion* viewed the problem from the Jewish standpoint, Herzl and the 'political' Zionists regarded it from the standpoint of a citizen of the world, *i.e.*, with the eyes of a cosmopolitan Jew or a cosmopolitan Gentile. If the efforts of Herzl had succeeded in convincing the non-Jewish world,

and if he had obtained the legal guarantees for which he strove, this phase of Zionist policy might have been justified as good tactics. In view of its failure, however, it was inevitable that it should give way to the other, the more strictly Jewish and Palestinian phase. The history of the movement shews in the clearest manner the gradual evolution of the one phase into the other.

Of the four lines of activity laid down by the Basle programme,* viz., the colonisation of Palestine, the organisation of the Jewish people, the strengthening of the national feeling, and lastly, political and diplomatic efforts to enlist the sympathy and assistance of powerful nations; the Zionist movement in the Herzlian period and for a few years after, while the supporters of his views remained in control, attached most importance to the organisation and the political side. Herzl believed strongly in political guarantees and looked on colonisation without such guarantees, *i.e.*, without a charter from the Powers, as undignified, harmful and practically useless. He set his heart upon the obtaining for the Jews of a charter recognising a Jewish autonomous community in Palestine, and to obtain this he made innumerable journeys and obtained interviews and even promises of support from European Kings and ministers. He had several audiences of the Sultan from 1897 onwards. In October, 1898, he had a memorable interview with Emperor Wilhelm II of Germany on the road to Jerusalem. In 1899 and 1902, he unfolded his scheme to the late Grand Duke of Baden, in 1900 to the King and Queen of Rumania, in 1902 and 1903 to Victor Emanuel II of Italy, to the Pope, and to Signor Tittoni, then Foreign Minister, in 1903 to Witte and von Plehve in St. Petersburg, and to Mr. Chamberlain in London. Unfortunately, without the help of the rich Jews, on which he had counted but which he could not gain, all these diplomatic successes yielded nothing concrete, nothing which materially advanced the realisation of the Zionist programme. Finding that Palestine was unobtainable by these political methods, Herzl was prepared to accept as a stepping stone autonomy in some other territory, preferably territory bordering on Palestine. This compromise was to be expected in one to whom the Jewish problem was merely political. In October, 1902, the Executive of the Zionist Organisation negotiated with the British Government for part of the Sinai peninsula to be granted to the Jews with powers of self government. These negotiations broke down owing to the requirements of the Egyptian government, and the Colonial Office made an offer to the Zionists of a piece of land in East Africa. The terms of this historical offer are

* The first article of the Basle programme is as follows: "Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by legal guarantees." See pamphlet, "Zionism and Jewish Problem," pp. 10 and 11.

contained in a letter of the 14th August, 1903, to Mr. L. J. Greenberg in regard "to the form of an agreement which Dr. Herzl proposes should be entered into between his Majesty's Government and the Jewish Colonial Trust, Ltd., for the establishment of a Jewish settlement in East Africa." The letter states that the Marquis of Lansdowne "has studied the question with the interest which his Majesty's Government must always take in any well-considered scheme for the amelioration of the position of the Jewish race . . . If a site can be found which the Trust and his Majesty's Commissioner consider suitable, and which commends itself to his Government, Lord Lansdowne will be prepared to entertain favourably proposals for the establishment of a Jewish colony or settlement on conditions which will enable the members to observe their national customs . . . the scheme comprising as its main features the grant of a considerable area of land, the appointment of a Jewish official as the chief of the local administration, and permission to the colony to have a free hand in regard to municipal legislation as to the management of religious and purely domestic matters, such local autonomy being conditional upon the right of his Majesty's Government to exercise general control."*

It was in the discussion of this offer that the difference between the two views of Zionism became most strongly marked. The Eastern Zionists who had all along accused Herzl of being a "Judenstaatler," that is, more concerned with autonomy than with Palestine, saw treachery in the very fact of entertaining such a proposal. There were stormy scenes at the sixth Congress in 1903, which dealt with the project. It threatened to split the movement, and did in fact create a schism, for in 1905, after the seventh Congress had received the report of the investigating commission that the territory was unsuitable, Israel Zangwill and a number of followers seceded and formed the Jewish Territorial Organisation, which aims at the obtaining of territory in any part of the world. By this secession the Zionist movement shed the majority of the adherents to the purely political view and the ascendancy of the other view became inevitable. The opposition to Herzl, which was so prominent at the sixth Congress, but which had been in existence from the very beginning, came from those Zionists who had been *Choveve Zion* before Herzl had become a Zionist, and who laid stress on the other half of the Basle programme, viz., practical colonisation work in Palestine and the deepening of the national feeling of the Jews. Their opposition was due also to their disbelief in the value of political and diplomatic endeavours. They preferred slow infiltration into Palestine

* Quoted in "Zionism," by Prof. Gottheil (Philadelphia, 1914), to which book readers are referred for a fuller treatment of the subject of this pamphlet.

rather than the waiting policy advocated by Herzl pending the obtaining of guarantees. After the death of Herzl had robbed the politicals of his commanding personality and influence, and after the definite victory of the nothing-but-Palestine party at the eighth Congress (1907), these Zionists, who became known as practical as opposed to political Zionists, grew more and more powerful. But they were not yet strong enough to combat the tradition left by Herzl, so that for a few more years the politicals remained in control of the movement. After the revolution in Turkey in 1908, it became clear to all that the "charter" idea was no longer tenable, and the political work of the movement began to centre in making it clear to Turkey that it was to her advantage to welcome Jewish immigration and enterprise in Palestine. The ninth and subsequent congresses have emphasised this view. Since the tenth Congress (1911) the 'practical' Zionists have been in control of the movement. The progress of the colonies and the remarkable renaissance of Jewish life in Palestine have helped to restore harmony between the two opposing parties. The present leaders, have, until the war, carried out the diplomatic portion of the programme in the only feasible manner, confining their efforts to the creation of a good understanding with Turkey. The changes consequent on the war have, however, made necessary a revival of political activity in order to make clear the aims and wishes of the Zionist organisation to all the Powers who may be interested in the future of Palestine.

The perfecting of the Zionist organisation was the other branch to which Herzl's endeavours were chiefly directed. Though they were attended with more success than his diplomatic activity there has been here also an inevitable change of policy. As we have seen, the number of adherents increased tenfold in the first few years, stimulated by the apparent imminence of a successful issue. The Vienna executive until 1903 or 1904 firmly believed in the possibility of achieving the Zionist object in the immediate future. Their speeches and letters confirmed this view and made the masses expectant and eager. Herzl believed also that the vast majority of the 12 or 13 million Jews of the world would rally round him and thus create a force of great political power. When months and years passed without any such realisation there was a reaction, and the years immediately following Herzl's death showed a falling off in the number of adherents. Since 1911, when the 'practicals' obtained control, a new policy has been noticeable, viz., to put Palestine in the forefront and to interest Jews in Palestine whether they became members of the organisation or not. This apparent disregard of direct propaganda has really had better results than 'direct' speech-making and attempting to gain adherents in order to become

a great political power. The movement has begun to recover under the influence of the visible progress of Jewish colonisation in Palestine. The number of Shekelpayers (*i.e.*, professed adherents of the movement) is still quite small (about 200,000) in comparison with the three or four million Jewish families of the world, but the influence of the movement on Jewish life and thought is immeasurable. The Zionist element is the most actively Jewish in almost every Jewish community and acts as a powerful bulwark against the tendency to drift and assimilation. This increasing and quietly powerful influence of Zionism among the Jewries of the world is due in large measure to the emphasis which has been laid in the last few years on the other two aims of the Basle programme—colonisation and the strengthening of the Jewish national consciousness.

A further example of the curious phenomenon previously referred to, whereby an instrument created by Herzl for one object has achieved quite another, is to be found in the "Jewish" Bank. As an auxiliary to his political endeavours Herzl had established in 1901 a Jewish Bank, the Jewish Colonial Trust, Limited (nominal capital £2,000,000) with the object of securing concessions in Palestine and floating a loan for Turkey. The rich Jews, however, boycotted the bank. But while the rich Jews kept strictly aloof from a project which seemed to them financially weak, the poor Jews—the splendid raw material, which had been overlooked—responded in an extraordinary manner. Over 130,000 Jews became shareholders, and yet the total amount taken up was only £240,000. In some Russian villages eight or nine Jews, with an enthusiasm and eagerness which are most pathetic, clubbed together to buy a £1 share. The failure to obtain at least £2,000,000 was a great disappointment to Herzl, whose mind was always centred on the purchase from the Sultan of the Crown lands in Palestine. The Bank, however, became under the influence of the 'practicals' of the greatest utility in furthering colonisation and credit in Palestine, especially through its offshoot the Anglo-Palestine Company, Limited.

All the recent land purchase in Palestine has been under the direct supervision of the Palestine bureau at Jaffa, a branch of the Zionist organisation which has proved itself highly efficient under the care of Dr. Ruppin. Agricultural schools and an Experimental Station have been established either directly by the organisation or stimulated by Zionists; and training has begun in real earnest for the task of creating a competent Jewish agricultural population. Land purchase and development by the Jewish National Fund (established 1901 and now amounting to over £200,000 contributed by small amounts from all over the world) and by the Palestine Land Development Company, Ltd., are on the increase in parts of

Palestine too difficult for private undertaking to work successfully. The National Fund has made possible the splendid new quarter of Jaffa known as Tel Aviv. This is a healthy and prosperous suburb where the houses are equipped with every comfort and hygienic requirement, forming a striking contrast to the miserable dwellings which they have to some extent replaced. There is also an International Health Bureau to combat malaria and trachoma, which are rife among the poorer population. The number of colonies is now over forty with a total population of about 15,000. But it is in the sphere of education that some of the most striking results have been achieved. Here again the direction was given outside the Zionist organisation. Hebrew has become, under the influence first of the *Choveve Zion* and later of the Zionist movement, a living national tongue used from the Kindergarten to the Training College. The numerous elementary schools, the two 'gymnasias' at Tel Aviv and at Jerusalem, the training colleges for men and for women, the thriving periodical publications ranging from an ordinary daily paper to a quarterly review of agriculture, the dramatic societies, athletic clubs and numerous other institutions in which Hebrew is the only medium, bear sufficient witness to the extraordinary success of the Hebrew revival in Palestine. The coping stone will be a Hebrew University at Jerusalem, the preliminary work for which had already, before the outbreak of the war, commenced in accordance with the resolution of the eleventh Congress (Vienna, 1913). The Hebrew revival is so recent that it is not yet widely known, but it is perhaps the most inspiring feature of Zionist progress in Palestine.

In 1904, the death of Herzl robbed the movement of the great genius who had known how to gather together the best elements of Jewry into an organisation. There was no one of his calibre to take his place and it was thought that Zionism had suffered a blow from which it would never recover. Had Zionism been only a political movement and the creation of one man it would probably not have survived, but Zionism was older than Herzl. As we have seen, the National Jewish consciousness of Eastern Jewry which he had hit upon almost by accident, was strong, much stronger than even he knew, and it successfully carried the movement over the anxious transition period. After Herzl, first Wolffsohn then a Committee of three, and finally a Committee of six took over the executive side of the movement. Since 1913, the Executive consists of Professor Otto Warburg (Chairman), Dr. E. W. Tschlenow (Vice-Chairman), Dr. Victor Jacobson, Dr. Arthur Hantke, Dr. Schmarya Levin, and Mr. Nahum Sokolow. The central office which was in Vienna during Herzl's life was, in 1911, moved to Berlin. Since the War, the bureau has removed to Copenhagen, on neutral territory.

There has been a great strengthening of the movement among the large Jewish population of America, which may influence the direction the movement will take after the war. Much, obviously, depends on the outcome of the great war now being waged, but the continuation of Jewish effort in Palestine is in a sense independent of the result. The first steps have been taken along the road that leads to a revival of Jewry in Palestine, and though many things may hinder, nothing can now stop its progress.

Zionism is still far from its goal, but its undeniable progress towards that goal has been accompanied by a wonderful revival of Jewish interest among Jews. Zionism has not solved, because it cannot solve, the problem of the oppressed Jews of Eastern Europe by finding for them a secure home. The Jews of Russia, Galicia and Rumania are too numerous; the very idea that they can be transferred quickly into a new country ready to receive them is fantastic. Zionism since the accession of the 'practicals' aims at Ahad Ha'am's ideal of establishing a centre or "nidus" in Palestine which shall be a home for the Jewish spirit rather than a place of refuge for crowds of wander-weary individual Jews. While that is being achieved in Palestine the Jews in the Diaspora must be prepared by education to see the urgency of such a "nidus." The Eastern Jews are forced by economic pressure to feel that they are strangers, the Western Jews by other forms of Antisemitism. But were these factors both absent, the Jewish need of a centre in Palestine would be just as urgent, even more urgent from the Nationalist point of view. The loss of the Jewish outlook, whether it be due to ill treatment or perfect equality, is an evil to the Jew and a loss to the world, and the Jews are doing their duty to the world by preserving their Jewish spirit in the only way by which it can be preserved—by giving it a healthy body.

Zionism has thus given to many Jews who were in danger of losing it, an 'ideal' for which to live. There is no longer need for Western Jews to choose between two equally unpleasant alternatives, the identifying themselves completely with the life of the country in which they live, or the shutting themselves out of the blessings of the modern world by an artificially created Ghetto. Zionism has shown that the Jew may drink freely of the springs of modern culture and yet remain Jewish. This feeling has given Jewish intellectuals a sense of freedom and a quiet confidence and optimism which they formerly lacked, and it has enabled them to devote their energies to various aspects of Jewish life without any feeling of shame. In every country and in every form of Jewish communal life, in education as in local politics, the Zionist influence is unmistakable. It is only a matter of time for the great Jewish organisations which have hitherto been remarkable

for their antinationalist prejudices to come round to the Zionist view, because it is the only really Jewish view. Zionism has also revealed to the Western Jews, as Herzl himself has shown, that their boasted superiority over the Eastern Jews whom they patronised condescendingly, has no foundation. They are beginning to recognise, for instance, that the Russian and Austrian Jews are not poor relatives to be hidden away, but rather wealthy brethren (rich in the spirit of loyalty to Judaism) who can help them very considerably. Under the influence of Zionism the West has realised its dependence on the East for all things Jewish. The striking manner in which Russian Jews—suffering untold agonies in Russia—yet refused even to consider any other land than Palestine as worth striving for, made Western Jews look on their Eastern brethren with a new respect.

The history of the Zionist movement is a record of the slow but inevitable yielding of Western political and non-Jewish views to the essentially Jewish national outlook which is now assuming control. The manner in which each failure of the early Zionist endeavours has turned under the irresistible pressure of a people's sentiment and will into a success never anticipated by the former leaders is the best proof that Zionism is the expression of that sentiment and the will to live. The older view is by no means dead, but the progress of Jewish activity in Palestine is establishing a synthesis between the opposing views.

Zionism by its actual achievements in Palestine has in addition to this inner harmony realised a twofold object. It has turned the eyes of all the Jewries of the world towards Palestine in a way which centuries of mere speechmaking and diplomacy could never have accomplished. It has at the same time showed the Gentile world the first instalment of what Jews can do in the way of transforming a desert into a flourishing country. Whatever changes the war may produce, the programme of Zionism remains the same. The last word in the matter does not rest with the world, but with the Jews themselves. It is to the Jews of all countries that Zionism speaks, pointing on the one side to the various lands of the earth in which the vast majority of their brethren are living more or less contentedly, more or less nobly, but without any real independence and in a state of spiritual malaise, and on the other to a little country in Asia Minor with which our people's history is inestimably bound up, and in which alone it can attain a future worthy of its wonderful past. And it says, "See, I have set before you this day life and good, and death and evil. Therefore, choose you life."

A Hebrew University for Jerusalem.

THE idea of founding a Hebrew University in Jerusalem has a history, although a brief one. It was certain to come to the front with the deepening of the Jewish consciousness which marked the closing years of the 19th century, and with the multiplication of Jewish colonies and schools in Palestine. Here was given the concrete evidence, which moves even the most sceptical of business men, that Hebrew as a living speech had a present and a future as well as a past, and that Jews could create for themselves a renaissance of their own, as well as share in the renaissance of other peoples.

The first to advocate the foundation of a Hebrew University was the late Professor Schapiro, who, however, died before he could convert his suggestion into a project. The idea lived on, and in 1901 the Fifth Zionist Congress passed a resolution calling upon the directors of the Zionist movement to make a careful enquiry into the possibility of founding a Hebrew University. The project had the hearty approval of Dr. Herzl, who was sanguine of obtaining a concession for the purpose from the Turkish Government. A handful of young Jewish students—not a few of whom have to-day attained to considerable Academic distinction—devoted themselves to popularising the idea, and, among other things, they produced a notable pamphlet “*Eine Jüdische Hochschule.*” The authors of this pamphlet took as their motto the words, “Give me Jabneh and her wise men,” which Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai spoke to Titus in the crisis of the Jewish state and nation. Like him they expressed faith that the seat of Jewish learning and the Jewish wise men would preserve and develop the Jewish spirit and the Jewish people even when political power and machinery had collapsed. The time, however, was not yet ripe, and the Hebrew University still remained a dream.

The next notable event in the history of the idea was the publication in 1908 of an article by Dr. Israel Abrahams on a University for Jerusalem. Apart from its other merits, the plea had two significant characteristics. Hitherto the advocates of a Hebrew University had been exclusively Zionists or Jewish nationalists. Dr. Abrahams did not and does not belong to this school of thought, so that his intervention indicated that a Hebrew University appeals to all Jews who have any belief whatsoever in the worth of a specifically Jewish contribution to the thought and life of the world. The second point is that for Dr. Abrahams the home of a Jewish University can be only Jerusalem. In "Eine Jüdische Hochschule," the desirability of planting the University in Palestine is recognised and emphasised, but the possibility is contemplated that it may be necessary as a concession to *force majeure* to begin by founding it in either England or Switzerland and only at a later stage transfer it to Palestine. After 1908, nobody who conceives the University as a Hebrew University, an expression of the Jewish spirit, thinks of any other home for it than Jerusalem. Probably the chief force in producing this definite conviction was the development of the Jewish settlement and the Hebrew language in Palestine. In the face of such a fact any other home than Palestine (which for this purpose must mean Jerusalem) became unthinkable.

The 11th Zionist Congress converted the Hebrew University from an idea discussed rather abstractly into a project the realisation of which must be taken seriously in hand. The chief business of that Congress was the decision, after hearing the report by Dr. Ch. Weizmann of Manchester, to set about the foundation of the University. A not inconsiderable sum of money was raised for the purpose during the course of the Congress, and the governing body of the movement subsequently set up an organisation for making propaganda on behalf of the University, formulating a scheme and securing the support and counsel of all sympathetic Jews throughout the world distinguished in Science, Art, and Commerce. From the first it was intended that in the realisation of the University all Jews, conscious of their Jewish past and confident in their Jewish future, should co-operate. This view was not reached under the pressure of practical considerations, although, of course, it is true that the restricted means of Zionists could not suffice to found and

maintain a Hebrew University on a scale comparable to the magnitude of its task. It was felt that a Hebrew University in Jerusalem must appeal to the deepest instincts of all Jews for whom Judaism is a living force, that all such Jews would welcome the opportunity of collaborating in so memorable an achievement, and that to make the founding of the central home of the Jewish spirit the work of a section or a party in Jewry would be to impoverish it in vital force, energy, and breadth.

All these various projects for a Jewish University in Palestine have had two essential features in common :—(1) that the seat of the University must be in Palestine, and therefore in Jerusalem (2) that it must be a Hebrew University, that is, the language of instruction must be Hebrew. There are certain obvious practical advantages in making Jerusalem the seat of a Hebrew University. Such a University must not only be established by the co-operation of Jews throughout the whole world, but also react very vitally upon Jews throughout the world. That is an argument for founding it in a place which all nations recognise to have such unquestionable claims, that its selection can provoke no suspicion or jealousy lest the spiritual treasury of Jewry might fall under the control of or be made to serve the policy of any one Power. Clearly Jerusalem fulfils these conditions as no other city of the world. No Jew whose Judaism is more than a phrase can be deaf to its appeal ; but I may quote a few words from Dr. Abrahams' article :—

“ If a Jewish University is at all desirable, there is no more suitable centre for it than Jerusalem. The law shall go forth from Zion—this ideal cannot be realised in any other portion of the world. What Jew would not be proud to spend a few years at the University of Jerusalem ? He may, as hitherto, go to Cambridge, Berlin, or Vienna. But if it was possible for him to attend a post graduate course in Jerusalem, would he not gladly seize the opportunity ? ”

Undoubtedly, even if political and other practical considerations counted for nothing, the unique character of Jerusalem in the history of our people, its unique place in our spiritual life and in our spiritual hopes for the future, would determine it as the one thinkable home for the Hebrew University.

Just as there are practical arguments for establishing the Jewish University in Jerusalem, so there are practical arguments for making it a *Hebrew* University, that is, a University the language of instruction in which is Hebrew.

A word of explanation may be conveniently interpolated at this point. Making Hebrew the language of instruction does not mean necessarily that all subjects from the very beginning shall be taught exclusively in Hebrew; nor does it mean that distinguished guests invited to lecture must lecture in Hebrew. There may be need, at the commencement, to teach some subjects temporarily in a language other than Hebrew; and it will always be necessary to keep the gates of academic hospitality open to eminent visitors from abroad, just as all Universities do. But so far as the regular teaching of the University is concerned, the aim must be to make Hebrew the language of instruction at the Jerusalem University, just as English is the language of instruction at London, Oxford, or Cambridge.

The teaching staff and the students of a Hebrew University at Jerusalem must from the nature of the case be drawn from the Jewish subjects of almost as many States as have Jews within their dominions. There will be Palestinian Jews, Russian, English, French, German, American, with a corresponding variety of speeches. Clearly no University can undertake to teach in all this Babel of tongues. It must, at least as a permanent system, teach in a single language, and that single language can only be Hebrew, because no European language could be preferred to another without involving the University in international politics, and shattering the unity of Israel in relation to the University. An English, French, or German University in Jerusalem cannot appeal to all Jews throughout the world, without distinction of political allegiance; so that such a University would fail in one of its chief purposes—becoming a spiritual centre for the whole of Jewry. The arguments against either Turkish or Arabic are even stronger. Not only are these tongues alien to the great host of Jews, so that a Jewish University making either of them the language of instruction would have no appeal to the overwhelming mass of Jews, but it would be impossible to secure either teachers or students, to say nothing of text books and vocabulary. The process of exclusion leaves us with Hebrew as the one possible language for the University in Jerusalem. It is the one tongue which excites no political

jealousies, makes no invidious distinctions between this state and that, and will rally teachers and students from the whole of Jewry. It is already the native language of the Jews of Palestine, who will also contribute a goodly fraction of the whole body of students, while a considerable familiarity with Hebrew is a common possession of hosts of Russian and Galician and Turkish Jews, and no Jew who takes his Judaism seriously can allow himself to be completely ignorant of Hebrew. If it be asked—can competent teachers be found to teach on a University standard in Hebrew?—the answer is that already many such are to hand, and that, for the rest, it is easy enough to secure that teachers shall equip themselves with the necessary knowledge of Hebrew during the years in which the University is preparing or growing. A year or two will suffice.

So far the case for Hebrew has been argued on strictly practical grounds, and, it is submitted, is conclusive even from that point of view. But it would be trifling with a great subject to suggest that these are the sole or the most important considerations. A language is not merely a piece of mechanism, a tool for doing a definite piece of practical work, which can be “scrapped” with a light heart when it becomes outworn or a later invention renders it obsolete. The language of a people is the highway along which the soul of a people marches in the fulfilment of its destiny. The language of a people is the medium by which its spirit expresses itself. It is not merely passive, it imparts to the colour, form and motion of the culture of that people that which renders it peculiarly and characteristically the culture of that people and of no other people. Job in English, Goethe in French, Shakespeare in Italian—these are neither Job nor Goethe nor Shakespeare. *Traduttore traditore*, translation is treason, runs the deep and wise saying. A Jewish University in Jerusalem teaching in another tongue than Hebrew would be treason to Judaism, to science, and to literature. To reach its goal the soul of the Jewish people requires its own highway—Hebrew. To express itself fully and freely, to relate its present and its future with its past, and to rise to the height of its lofty argument in the debate of humanity, the Jewish spirit must live in Hebrew. Hebrew will liberate the unexhausted treasures of the Jewish soul, and set them in circulation; and through Hebrew and in Hebrew the Torah will once more go forth from Zion as in the past. Set a Jewish University in

Jerusalem studying and teaching in an alien tongue, and there will be repeated the old Jewish tragedy of civil war within the soul, more melancholy and more devastating than civil war within the State. That unity of heart and brain and speech, which breeds prophets, artists, the breakers of new paths in science or in letters, could hardly be looked for. It is commonly said that since the Diaspora Jews have given to the world less than their just quota of supreme intelligences. If such a charge can be brought with plausibility against a people which in its early unity flooded the world with light, is there not here evidence of the ruin which has been wrought by the divorce between the Jewish people and the Jewish speech—Hebrew?

What is the function of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem? That is the central question, for a Jew must be satisfied on this point if he is to be moved to sympathy and co-operation. As throughout this discussion, there are two different sets of arguments, not antagonistic, still less incompatible, but distinct, and therefore better treated distinctly—the nearer and strictly practical, the remoter but more largely significant. A Hebrew University is or soon will be a need of the Jews of Palestine and Turkey. There are a hundred thousand Jews in Palestine, with their own schools, elementary and secondary; there are perhaps four times that number throughout the Ottoman Empire. For the present to get a University education or something approaching its equivalent, they must go to Europe or beg the dubious charity of missionary institutions in Turkey. Nor is Europe open to them all. The Universities of many European States are already shut or about to be shut in the faces of the majority of alien Jewish students who seek admission. Here attention must be drawn to that other Jewish element for which a Hebrew University in Palestine is an urgent need—the Russian Jews. Most Jews know that the percentage norm and other ingenious devices of the persecutor exclude most Russian Jewish students from the Russian Universities. These students have poured in their thousands across the frontier to seek admission to non-Russian Universities—German, Swiss, French, more recently Italian, and in much lesser measure English and American. The magnitude of this exodus can with difficulty be appreciated by those who have not come into direct contact with these Russo-Jewish student colonies, or have not looked into the literature of the question.

During the last few years a movement, Anti-Semitic in fact though hypocritically represented as anti-foreign, has seized hold of the students and the directors of many German Universities. As a result the Prussian Universities have applied to "Russian" students, which in practice means the Russo-Jewish students, the percentage norm in operation in Russia. The Saxon and Bavarian Universities have adopted the same or a similar restrictive clause, which will soon become universal throughout Germany. Similar movements are traceable in France and Switzerland, and no rational man can, in the light of experience elsewhere, ignore their significance. The Russian restrictive legislation in educational matters has already followed the Russian Jew in Germany and is likely to pursue him throughout the Continent. The prison walls are rapidly closing round the Russo-Jewish student; it is one of the urgent tasks of the general body of Jewry to bring him enlargement.

Why, it may be asked, should these young men and women, desperately poor most of them, uncertain of their economic future many of them, be assisted to go to a University; why should they not take to a handicraft or commerce, and cease to flood the world of Jewry with an intellectual proletariat? If we, safely (for the time being) planted on the shore, could command the flood with a word, such questions would have greater relevance than in fact attaches to them. It must be remembered that we Jews are unique in this, that for some two thousand years we have enjoyed a system of education, at once of University standard and democratic. A deep and wide knowledge of Jewish learning has, since an age when Europe and most of the world was sunk in the darkness of ignorance, been within the reach of every Jewish lad competent to take advantage of it; in no section of Jewry has this been truer than in Russian Jewry. Whatever else may be said of this system of study, no understanding person will deny that as an intellectual discipline, and for the rigorous devotion of a lengthy term of years which it demanded of the student, it ranks with the degree course of any university. The Russian youths therefore, who are seeking a University education of the ordinary Western type, are not a revolting proletariat suddenly awakening to consciousness of what it imagines to be its rights. They are simply exercising in a modern form a right which has belonged to intelligent Jewish youths for some two thousand years. The

point of application has changed, but the force is the same ; and it is a force which should not occasion censure but provoke pride. For that which it represents is a tradition of enduring educational activity such as no other people can boast.

A movement so ancient, with its roots so deep down in the Jewish consciousness, clearly cannot be checked at a word from without. Nor could it be checked at all without grave hurt to the Jewish people. We are what we are largely as a result of a wide diffusion, persisting through the ages, of intense intellectual culture. To stop that would be a revolution, a fearful surgical operation on the soul of a people, which no man of insight and vision ventures to recommend unless he has surveyed patiently and exhaustively the whole ground and found no other way. The attempt to enforce a decree of ignorance would condemn half of universal Jewry, and certainly not the least worthy or robustly Jewish half, to the agony of a tragedy of spiritual starvation ; but it could not succeed. The hunger for intellectual training would insist upon satisfaction somehow. The sombre increase in perversions among the academic youth of Russia indicates one terrible outlet. Russian Jewry does not say to Western Jewry, " Give us the possibility of education or we seek it through baptism." The Jewish sense of Russian Jewry is too high, and such a demand could be answered only with an emphatic and indignant negative. But the Jewries which recognise the duty of taking special measures for defending even their weak members against the " privy paw " of the missionary wolves, cannot repudiate that duty in the case of their Russian brethren, who are harried far more terribly and subjected to temptations unimaginally heavier. Within the limits of their capacity Jews more happily circumstanced must continue to their Russian brethren the possibilities of a University education.

Such an education as a Hebrew University in Jerusalem would provide is the best compromise between the new and old which can be conceived. At any ordinary University for Jews there is no tincture of the old ; the break with the Jewish tradition is complete, and only the most serious efforts upon the part of the individual students can make good to any perceptible degree this grave defect. Who that has any first-hand familiarity with Universities here and on the Continent will suggest that these individual efforts can be counted upon ? In the Hebrew University at Jerusalem everything will make for as much

harmonising of past with present as can be reasonably expected. The language of instruction, Hebrew, will carry the student along the main stream of Jewish evolution. The atmosphere of the University will be Jewish with an intensity not known elsewhere. Jewish teachers, Jewish colleagues, Jewish studies, the consciousness of partaking in the most memorable renaissance of Judaism since the beginning of the exile—what youth could resist the shaping magic of such forces?

The need of the Jewish University teacher and researcher is second quantitatively, but not second qualitatively, to the need of the Jewish student; and it is more world-wide. If only to Russo-Jewish students are the gates of the European Universities shut or shutting, in more than one country outside Russia is the Jewish scholar denied the just academic reward of his attainments and refused the opportunity to teach and push further the bounds of knowledge. The discrimination varies in degree. In Prussia the price of a professorial chair is normally baptism; elsewhere it may be only years of waiting, slight and mortification. But the discrimination means that a great treasure of Jewish spiritual and intellectual force is rendered sterile, while in many lands even the less unfortunate Jewish scholars work under the crippling influence of injustice, mental division and revolt against a brutal and unsympathetic environment. In the Hebrew University at Jerusalem the scholar will find the reward of his talents; he will enjoy the spiritual freedom which is one of the conditions most favourable to scientific achievement; he will be surrounded by sympathetic colleagues; he will be stimulated by the knowledge that what he contributes to Science, to Art, and to Literature will redound to the glory of his own people, instead of being added to the account of another, it may be anti-Semitic, people. There is no need to emphasise or elaborate what that should mean to Judaism and to the world.

The weight of the practical argument for the Hebrew University in Palestine must not be exaggerated, solid though it is. The University can supply the higher educational needs of Palestine and Turkish Jewry, but may never be large enough to meet all the needs of Russian Jewry. So far as the Russian student is concerned it may be a palliative rather than a cure, but even so a palliative of worth. Far greater, however, must be the significance of the Hebrew University to those Jews

who seek the realisation of their whole lives, not merely the preparation for a professional career, in study, research, and teaching.

The practical utility of a Hebrew University, which may be defined as its capacity to promote the economic welfare of individuals, is, in any large view, of much less importance than its spiritual utility, its capacity to promote the spiritual welfare of the Jewish people. A few years ago the whole German people celebrated the centenary of the foundation of the Berlin University. Berlin University was founded in the dark days of Prussian defeat and decline after the battle of Jena, and it was founded with the deliberate purpose of saving the national spirit, the national pride and the national confidence. Every historian is agreed that it contributed mightily to the Prussian renaissance, which in time became the German renaissance. The Berlin University is in this respect typical, and from the records of most civilised countries parallel examples might be cited. It is enough to say that a University is a factor of vital significance in the spiritual and intellectual life of peoples as well as of individuals, and that its significance varies according as the people is endowed with much or little other common apparatus. We Jews have the very minimum of such common apparatus. It is hardly true to say that we have a common faith and worship, for we are divided into numerous sects. We certainly have no common ecclesiastical organisation to which all Jews throughout the world submit. In the temporal, as distinct from the ecclesiastical sphere, we are without any universally accepted authority. With us Jews the conditions favour the maximum influence of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

To recognise the necessity to Judaism of such a spiritual centre as a Hebrew University in Palestine, it is sufficient to believe that we Jews have a specifically Jewish contribution to make to the thought, the art, and the culture of the world. Once concede that and we are led straight to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Clearly such a contribution cannot be made in the Diaspora. We may have brilliant scholars in the Diaspora, bold philosophers, artists of vision; but they cannot render a full and free Jewish inspiration. They are bred in a non-Jewish atmosphere; the schools that train them, the men and women association with whom fashions them, the books they read, the shape and form of the cities they live in,

the moral standards they absorb—all are non-Jewish and in most cases Christian in mood and colour. Such an environment must inevitably render vain the hope of a specifically Jewish contribution to the world. In any event, no such environment can act as a Jewish centre. There are as many such environments as there are States among which we Jews are scattered, and each of them bears the badge of a different nation, in all cases not a Jewish badge. It may be asked, are not the Jewish theological seminaries in the Diaspora able to give us what we need? Apart from the fact that these seminaries, too, inevitably reflect the national character and quality of the State in which they are planted, the spiritual life of a nation is more than theology, and the Jewish contribution to the world, though assuredly it will embrace theology, will be wider than theology; it will cover every spiritual, intellectual and artistic activity. Nothing less than a Hebrew University, and a Hebrew University broad-based upon a pulsating Jewish life, can do that. We can get that in Palestine and in Palestine alone. There we have the freedom to be specifically Jewish, for no dominant alien culture exists in Palestine to claim authority. There we have the Jewish life, still small but intense. There we have the centre to which the heart of every conscious Jew turns, and from which as from no other quarter he awaits and is prepared to accept Jewish guidance and Jewish instruction.

No effort of imagination is required to conceive how a Hebrew University in Jerusalem would work upon the whole body of Jewry. Jews from all over the world would flock there either to take the full University course or to crown a University course commenced in the Diaspora. They would come there into intimate contact with Jewish teachers and Jewish students working freely in a Jewish atmosphere for the full expression of the Jewish spirit. They would return, having drunk of the new-old well of living waters, to spread among all the scattered legions of Jewry their deepened Jewish faith and their widened Jewish understanding. The disease of modern Jewry, by general admission, is disintegration. In Germany some "native" Jews are not ashamed to call upon the State to discriminate against the "foreign" Jew. We are breaking into fragments, and the fragments are being powdered into dust by the grinding of alien ideas and alien faiths. There is only one remedy—to resume

contact with the past in which we ourselves were one. Out of Zion must the Law go forth.

The case for a Hebrew University in Jerusalem, both on practical and ideal grounds, will appeal to every Jew who is sensitive to the deeper movements in Judaism. But even those who feel the force of the argument may yet have certain practical considerations to urge against the scheme. It will be well, therefore, to deal briefly with the principal objections and criticisms.

(1) The time is not ripe. Palestine is too poor economically and too little developed educationally for a University.

(2) A Hebrew University will not meet the crying need of those Jewish students who are excluded from European Universities. Being on the one hand a University which conducts its teaching in Hebrew, and on the other hand a new University without a reputation, it will not be able to fit its students for positions in Europe, still less to confer degrees which will be a passport to such situations.

(3) That being so, the students will be an "intellectual proletariat"—a body of educated men with no outlet; for Europe will be closed to them, and Palestine offers as yet no field.

(4) To give a University education in Hebrew is itself impracticable. There are no first-rate professors who can teach in Hebrew, no text-books on scientific subjects, no technical terminology.

These objections may be considered one by one, though they overlap to some extent.

(1) The strength of the effective demand for a Hebrew University in Jerusalem is not to be measured by the strength of the Jews in Palestine. The demand comes from all those Jews who are, so to speak, spiritually in Palestine—that is to say, those for whom the production of a Hebrew type of life in Palestine or a specifically Jewish contribution to the world is an ideal and an impulse to practical effort. It may be a question (a question only to be decided by actual trial) whether these conscious Jews are strong enough to carry out the project, but the time to try has come when they feel that it has come. The determining factor is not the economic condition of Palestine, but the spiritual condition of Jews the world over. And as regards the source from which the students are to be drawn, it follows that there is no need to wait until there are sufficient secondary schools in Palestine to feed a University. Being a creation of the Jewish

people, it will aim at meeting the educational needs of the whole people; that is, at providing a Hebrew education for all Jews who want a Hebrew education.

(2) But, it is said, who are the Jews who want a Hebrew education? Setting aside the comparatively few products of Hebrew schools in Palestine, will not the students who will go to the Hebrew University be those Russians who cannot get any longer into European Universities? And is it of any use to provide a Hebrew University for these people if it will not give them what, until recently, they have been able to get out of European Universities—the opportunity of turning their gifts to practical use and making a living? In a word—it may be argued—you are setting up a University which is to produce a new type of cultured man—a cultured Hebrew, a man whose whole culture will come to him through the medium of Hebrew, and whose whole mentality will be moulded by Hebrew influences; but the people who will go to your University will not be people who want to be turned into this type or that, but people who want to be able afterwards to enter one of the various professions in some European country.

In answer to this objection, it must be pointed out first of all that the value of a University is not to be measured by the test of the extent to which it enables its students to “make their way in the world.” The business of a University is to provide a liberal education, and of a Hebrew University to provide a liberal Hebrew education; and the Hebrew University will be a failure if it simply aims at fitting Jews for careers. All that needs to be secured is that in the process of fulfilling its proper function—that of producing educated or cultured Hebrews—it shall not unfit its students for taking part in the world’s work.

There is no reason to anticipate any such evil result. The student of the Hebrew University will, it is true, be a foreigner in any country of western Europe, but the Russian Jewish student—with whom we are particularly concerned at present—is that already. Russian Jews who have been educated in German or Swiss Universities often go back to Russia to work as doctors, engineers, or lawyers; they know the Russian language, and the fact that they have received their higher education in German is no hindrance. Their position will be no worse if they receive their higher education in Hebrew. As regards the rest—those who find scope for their activities elsewhere than in Russia—

their chances will similarly be little affected, so far as the language question goes. It is not to be anticipated that any student will leave the Hebrew University with no knowledge of any European language. If it were impossible for a man to make a living in Germany or England without that perfect command of the German or the English language which belongs to a native, there would clearly be little chance as things are for the Russian Jew who has to go outside Russia for his University training. In so far, therefore, as the Hebrew University would train Russian Jewish students who would or might otherwise go to non-Russian Universities in Europe, it would leave them no worse off than they would have been otherwise. It is not suggested that the Hebrew University could take all those would-be students whom restrictive legislation is shutting out of European Universities ; but then that is not its object, and the only question is whether those of them who do find places in it will be robbed of the chance of making use of their education by getting it in Hebrew. That question can be answered in the negative. And on the other hand it may be anticipated that the Hebrew training, being more in harmony than a German training with the traditions and the spirit of the student from the ghetto, will make for greater harmony and stability of mind. The Russian Jew suffers incalculably from getting his "western" education in an atmosphere entirely different from that in which he was born and brought up.

There remains the question whether the Hebrew University can hope to give as good a training in science or in philosophy as *e.g.*, a German University can give. There is no reason why it should not. There are Jews who are eminent in all branches of learning ; it will be necessary to attract them to the Hebrew University, and to give them time to acquire the power of teaching in Hebrew. This may involve the offer of high salaries ; but that is purely a matter of finance. Of course the Hebrew University will have to fight its way to recognition ; but every new University has to do that. It is worth mentioning in this connection that the leaving certificates of the Hebrew *Gymnasium* at Jaffa, which is less than ten years old, are accepted by certain European and American Universities.

(3) It has been shown above that, in so far as the students of the Hebrew University must look to Europe for their openings, there is no need to fear the creation of an "intellectual proletariat,"

at least not to any greater extent than that phenomenon has been created for years past and is being created at present. But it is not in fact correct to assume that Europe will afford the only outlet. Within the Turkish Empire itself, of which Palestine forms a part, there must be a wide field of activity for doctors, for lawyers, for teachers, for engineers—a field which is at present closed to Russian Jewish students. Even the needs of Palestine itself, small though they are at present, cannot be entirely disregarded. The colonisation movement is growing slowly but steadily; the need for the creation of better hygienic conditions in the towns is being more fully realised, and men trained on the spot will be better able to meet the resulting needs than foreigners. The close of the War ought to intensify the demand.

(4) So far as literature, history, and philosophy are concerned, the Hebrew language of to-day is perfectly well fitted to be a medium of higher education. Its shortcomings are confined to the purely technical scientific subjects. But even here something has already been done in the way of creating an appropriate terminology, especially in medicine (where in fact the Talmud offers a very extensive vocabulary). This process can be carried further, and a certain number of the most necessary text-books can be translated into Hebrew, or written anew. The professors can acquire the necessary knowledge of Hebrew by living in Palestine for a couple of years before they begin to teach. The language difficulty undoubtedly exists. But it will be put forward as fatal only by those who really object to the University idea on other grounds. If the idea is accepted in principle, the difficulty of the language becomes one of the practical obstacles that can be overcome, given the conviction that they must be overcome.

How the Hebrew University in Jerusalem shall begin is a practical question which Jewry itself can determine. It is no impossible dream that it might be founded complete from the beginning. More than one American University has been made by the generosity of a single pious founder, and the three million pounds worth of pictures which an American Jew left to a New York gallery a year or two ago would have sufficed to give Jewry the Hebrew University in Jerusalem on the most ample scale. Still, we must look on slow growth from small beginnings as the more probable course for the Hebrew University.

It might begin with one or two faculties, or it might begin as a research institute. Whether it shall begin in one fashion rather than in another is not a question of principle but one of expediency, to be determined by a consideration of difficulties and conveniences, and of the wishes of those who by their far-sighted generosity render any beginning at all practicable. The only two matters of principle are:—that the aim to be steadily preserved shall be expansion into a full University embracing every branch of culture which is fully within the scope of the best Universities; and that the Jerusalem University shall be a Hebrew University, the language of which for teaching and publication shall be Hebrew. Only slightly less important is the necessity that whatever be the original form of the University shall be excellent of its kind, comparable with the best of the like kind throughout the world. Nothing less could satisfy the high destiny for which it is marked out. There need be no fear, if a start is made in this fashion, that the germ may not develop. There is no lack of Jewish honour and Jewish generosity. What has been lacking hitherto has been direction. Once lay the foundations of a Hebrew University in Palestine, and Jewish pride and Jewish enthusiasm will secure that the fabric arising upon those foundations will be worthy to become that spiritual centre for which Judaism and Jewry hunger.

Zionism and the State.

By H. SACHER.

ZIONISM has one foot in Palestine and one foot outside Palestine. The politics of Zionism constitute therefore a double problem. The Zionist endeavouring to re-establish the elements of a Jewish national life in Palestine is faced with the necessity of explaining his aims to the rulers of that country, justifying, defining, correcting misapprehensions. The Zionist as a citizen of England, France, Germany, or the United States, with his national hopes set on Palestine, may be called upon to explain to his fellow-citizens his divided loyalty. These two problems are quite different in character. It is Zionism which has to prove that it deserves the sympathy instead of the suspicion of the rulers of Palestine; it is the individual English, French, German, or American Zionist who has to prove that the striving after Jewish Nationalism is compatible with the extra-Palestinian citizenship which he enjoys. In the first case the problem is strictly practical, and the answer to it can be gained by an inquiry into the needs of Palestine and into what the Jews have already achieved and aim at accomplishing there. In the second case the problem is almost entirely theoretical, and calls for some inquiry into the nature of the State. A statesman may quite excusably require rigid demonstration that the ambitions cherished by Zionists in Palestine imply no menace to the integrity or the power of the state which controls Palestine; but nobody seriously imagines that the strengthening of the Jewish consciousness by the instrumentality of a Jewish centre in Palestine would be injurious to either England, France, Germany, or the United States. It is not the object pursued by the Zionist, but his state of mind, his dual patriotism, which is the problem outside Palestine.

The world is in the full shock and tumult of a great war, and no man knows which of the Powers will issue from it the ruler of Palestine. The Zionist can show that Zionism ought to be welcomed as a force making for the strength of Palestine, whosoever is the ruler of Palestine. It may be assumed that every rational government desires the lands under its control to be developed to their utmost by a loyal, active, enterprising and intelligent population. We Zionists can promise the rulers of Palestine to make of the Holy Land something unique in Asia—a country the citizens of which are inferior to the best races of Europe neither in vigour of body nor in strength of mind nor in talent for practical achievement, and yet identified with the soil upon which they dwell not as a ruling caste but as a society complete in all departments and all social grades. To the ruler of Palestine who deals justly and generously with the Jews and their labours in Palestine there would go out naturally the sympathy and the moral support of all the scattered hosts of Jewry throughout the world—a political fact which it would be imprudent to underrate; and if we pass from the argument of expediency to the higher ground of political justice, then we may see in a Jewish Palestine a contribution towards one of the most obstinate of political problems—the conflict between East and West. We Zionist Jews belong to the Orient by blood and by the essential matter of our civilisation, but we have lived in the Occident and learnt to appreciate without becoming enslaved by its civilisation. If ever a synthesis or a reconciliation of East and West is to be achieved, the Jewish people, which spiritually stands astride East and West, seems chosen to effect it in and through that land which is the gateway between East and West. But, obviously, the present time is not suited to a discussion in detail of this practical question: we must delay the full answer until with the coming of peace it presents itself concretely and can be argued with all the force which comes from the concrete. For the present we may more profitably discuss the second and more theoretical, political question involved in Zionism—the harmonising of the Zionist's specifically Jewish patriotism with his duty as a citizen of a state which may not include Palestine within its dominions.

We all know that it is the non-Zionist Jew rather than the Gentile who usually raises the objection that Zionism and English patriotism are inconsistent. The thoughtful Gentile readily recognises that Zionism is the duty of the Jew, and even minds that are instinctive rather than philosophic usually accept the nationalism of the Jew as inevitably

as the peculiarity of his physiognomy. Nor is this liberalism of treatment the exclusive prerogative of the Jew. When recently a merchant of Greek extraction, who had gained a vast fortune in England, dedicated the bulk of his estate to Greek causes, including the building of the Greek fleet, no Englishman protested that his conduct was an outrage upon England. It must be admitted that the fact that the Englishman is not distressed by Zionism does not dispose of the theoretical problem of the dual patriotism—that remains to be investigated—but it does reduce it pretty strictly to the limits of a purely theoretical problem, without practical importance so far as our relations with our neighbours are concerned. The vision painted by anti-Zionists of anti-Semitism generated and justified by Zionist doctrine is fantastic. Anti-Semitism may become very active, and the position even of the Jewish élite in this country may be deprived of its exceptional charm; but Zionism is not likely to be the cause of such a movement. In so far as they know of the existence of Zionism Englishmen respect it and the men who are associated with it. They are more readily provoked by the profession of ultra-English nationalism and the denial of Jewish nationalism on the part of Jews. This attitude is likely to endure, because it expresses the mind of the Englishman. The average Englishman, while conceding the justice of full equality of rights to Jews, thinks of them as a body different from the mass of Englishmen, a distinct corporate entity with a different history and tradition. The Jew who denies the national or racial solidarity of Jews, and proposes absorption in the Gentile milieu around him, appears to the average Englishman to be repudiating a historic and natural loyalty to his own people, and to be preparing a strange foundation upon which to build a new ultra-loyalty.

We shall be in a better position to understand the logic of the Zionist position if we examine the position of the anti-Zionist Jew. Such Jews as in their zeal for assimilation accept baptism and intermarriage may be put out of court. They are logical, but they cease to be Jews. There remain the Jews who profess that the only feature which distinguishes Jews from other Englishmen is a peculiarity of religion. Jews, they allege, are a sect, and the Jewish Englishman as natural as the Catholic Englishman, the Baptist Englishman, or the Atheist Englishman. This sounds plausible enough, but will not bear serious investigation. The word "religion" covers a multitude of things only very slightly related to one another. The Catholic Englishman, the Baptist Englishman, the Atheist Englishman, these can be and are made every day; as Catholic,

Baptist, or Atheist, they have no special community of blood, no special community of historic past, added to community of special belief. This or that ceremony, this or that profession of faith admits each fully to the sect of which he is a member, and just because his religion is in no degree identified with blood or kinship he can and does marry freely beyond the bounds of the sect. It may be that there is a tendency among them to associate or even to marry within the sectarian circle, but that does not affect the truth of the broad outlines of this characterisation. Can it be said that the Jew, even the Jewish Englishman, is made in the same sense that the Catholic or Protestant Englishman is made? Theoretically the Gentile may be converted and the proselyte enjoy the full status of the born Jew. Practically even the most assimilated Jew admits that there is a world of difference between the proselyte and the born Jew, and that the born Jew is the genuine type of the Jew. When the Jew or the non-Jew thinks of the Jew, he thinks not merely of an individual who accepts the creeds and lives according to the *Shulchan Aruch*, he thinks of one who is also the descendant of Jews, linked with Judaism by countless generations of common history, and linked with other Jews by kinship and age-long experience as well as by faith. Blood and race are inseparable from the idea of the Jew; they have nothing to do with the idea of Catholic or Protestant. That is a broad distinction which ruins the plausible doctrine that Jews are merely a sect in the same way that Catholics or Protestants are merely a sect. "Englishman of the Jewish persuasion" is a formula which will not hold water, unless "Jewish" is to be interpreted as our forefathers did not interpret it, as the overwhelming majority of Jews do not interpret it and as hardly a single Gentile interprets it. Jews are not only the possessors of a peculiar faith, they are a peculiar people. The two elements, theological and racial, are inseparable in Judaism. They are Judaism looked at from two different points of view. To cut out the national element is not to leave the other surviving even as a mutilated religion; it is to cut through the heart of Judaism and to destroy Judaism as a whole. Such a formula, then, as "Englishman of the Jewish persuasion" is more than a repudiation of Zionism; it is a repudiation of Judaism. It assimilates Judaism to the host of creeds from which it is different not in degree or in detail, but in kind and in essence. It treats it as simply a body of doctrines and formularies like this or that species of Christianity, instead of as a way of life and a discipline and a philosophy and a world-outlook. That is pernicious and anti-Jewish.

Very little observation serves to show that the anti-Zionist Jew does not live according to his formula. He associates almost exclusively with Jews; his public activities are very largely concerned with Jewish affairs; he is interested possibly in Jewish learning, almost certainly in Jewish philanthropy; and not less certainly his Jewish sympathies know no territorial limits. The suffering of Jews in Russia, Morocco, Persia, affects the Jew in England as keenly as the suffering of Jews in Whitechapel or Tredegar. Is the anti-Zionist Jew acting merely as the member of a certain sect which happens to have adherents scattered throughout the globe, and is the only tie which unites him with the suffering Jews of the world the tie of a common faith? Catholics, it may be said, associate chiefly with Catholics, their philanthropy is chiefly for the benefit of Catholics; a Catholic in England feels the troubles of Catholics in France or Portugal as keenly as the troubles of Catholics in England; and the Englishman of the Jewish persuasion, it may be argued, acts precisely as the Englishman of the Catholic persuasion. The argument contains one radical fallacy. The faith of a Catholic in England is identical with the faith of a Catholic in Portugal or France or Italy. Their religion is one, they are members of one and the same church. Can it, however, be said that the religion of Dr. Kohler, or M. Reinach, or Mr. C. G. Montefiore is the religion of Rabbi Reiness, or of the Chaluka Jew in Jerusalem, or of the Jew in the Mogador Mellah, or of the Jew in the Yemen, or even of the Jew in an East End Chevra? The question has but to be put to be answered in the negative. For Mr. Montefiore the religion of the orthodox Jew is error, for M. Reinach folly. For the orthodox Jew the religion of Mr. Montefiore is perilously like Christianity and the religion of M. Reinach indistinguishable from Atheism.

A common faith does not link these heterogeneous units, because they have no common faith; a common church does not exact their allegiance and impose a common fellowship, because they are not members of a common church. Does the world offer any instance of a religion wide enough to embrace men to whom the whole Bible is an archæological curiosity, men to whom Jesus is the greatest of the prophets, and men to whom the New Testament is anathema? Does the world offer any instance of a church comprehensive enough to include sects as various as French illuminati, Christolaters and loyal adherents of the *Shulchan 'Aruch*? Yet that is the grotesque fiction which anti-Zionist Jews have to call into being in order to rest their sympathy with other Jews upon a

religious basis. The truth is that the bond of union between them and the oppressed Jews of all lands is the bond expressed by the Hebrew name of the *Alliance: Kol Israel Chaberim*. It is the sense of kinship, of racial solidarity. They are nationalist Jews in spite of themselves, because Jewish national or racial instinct of some sort is the only bridge which can carry them across to their brethren. It should not be necessary to add that no slur is intended upon the sincerity of these men. The explanation they give of their conduct is given quite honestly, though it will not bear examination; it is a common enough phenomenon for our instincts to set our reason harder tasks than it can manage. What matters is the fact; and the fact is that when the anti-Zionist Jew takes an active interest in the welfare of other Jews he is taking an interest not in members of the same sect but in members of the same race. The aim of the *Alliance* is philanthropic; the aim of the Zionist organisation is nationalist. But the *Alliance* is as surely a monument to Jewish racial solidarity as is the Zionist organisation. Jewish racial solidarity called it into being, and Jewish racial solidarity keeps it in being. It follows that the "Englishman of the Jewish persuasion" who interests himself actively in the *Alliance* or any similar institution comes into as direct a conflict with his own conception of English citizenship as does the Zionist. How can this abiding concern, springing from common kinship, in the fortunes and misfortunes of a race scattered over the face of the globe, be reconciled with an all-absorbing English citizenship which requires that the Englishman shall be first and last in the citizen's thoughts?

But even if we assume, for the sake of argument, that the only difference between the Jew and other English citizens is a difference of religion, the position of the anti-Zionist Jew becomes no whit more secure. Can it be said that inside the synagogue he is a Jew, and outside the synagogue he is an Englishman? The person who claims that Jews are only a sect must be assumed to attach some importance to religion; but religion is not a thing which is donned and doffed with the *tallith*. It penetrates the whole of a man's life; it colours all his thoughts; it shapes all his acts which are not purely technical. The religion which does not do all this must sit very lightly upon a man, or be a very faint shadow of a real faith. A religion which is genuine, sincere and deep must mould a man's citizenship as well as his sectarianism, and if his religion is fundamentally different from the religion of his fellow citizens, it must set him apart from them outside the synagogue as well as within the synagogue, on week-days

not less than on the Sabbath. The religion of the Jew is fundamentally different from the religion of the Gentile Englishman. Protestants of various shades and Catholics are all species of Christian; even the Gentile Atheist is very much of a Christian, for the civilisation of this country, its morals, its philosophy, its point of view are very largely the result of Christian influences, and the Atheist absorbs these from the atmosphere in which he lives and is bred, although he may repudiate the dogmas of Christianity. But the Jew, unlike them all, draws none of his spiritual being from Christianity, but from a spring which is not only older, but essentially different in character. Jewish morals are not Christian morals, Jewish philosophy is not Christian philosophy, the Jewish world-attitude is not the Christian world-attitude. Judaism and Christianity are two distinct genera, and the anti-Zionist Jew who claims that the difference between him and his Gentile fellow-citizens is merely one of religion is not abolishing but revealing a vast barrier between him and them. There is of course one way in which he can make his theory fit in with his intentions—he can abolish the fundamental differences between his religion and the religion of his fellow-citizens. It is a matter of common knowledge that some men have followed that way, and such a movement as the Jewish Religious Union not only represents an approximation of Judaism to Christianity; it represents also an attempt to make the formula “Englishman of the Jewish persuasion” a less absurd proposition. Such attempts mean the destruction of Judaism. The name may be kept, but the thing has ceased to be. The anti-Zionist Jew who wishes to be a Jew and not a species of Christian must reconceive himself to be something different in kind from his Gentile fellow-citizen, as different in kind as the Zionist.

The theory that the Jew in England can be simply a variety of Englishman different from others only at odd hours during the year and in trifling details has been shown to be a fallacy. It has also been shown that even anti-Zionist Jews who interest themselves in the affairs of Jews outside the British Empire are compelled in fact to throw over that theory. It has further been shown that the anti-Zionist Jew who is in any real sense a Jew comes as inevitably into conflict with his own conception of English citizenship as does the Zionist. In brief, Zionist and anti-Zionist, all Jews who are genuinely Jews, are in much the same boat as far as the problem of “dual patriotism” is concerned. It is important for Zionists to establish that, because by doing so they blunt the controversial weapon most commonly employed by anti-Zionists. To

meet the Gentile Englishman they must necessarily adopt a different line of argument.

It was suggested above that there is not likely to be a practical conflict between the duties imposed by Zionism and the duties imposed by English patriotism. The re-establishment in Palestine of a centre of Jewish national life would collide with no British interest. But it is not enough for Zionists to say that the object of their endeavour is perfectly reconcilable with British interests. It can be retorted that citizenship involves entire single-minded devotion to the country of residence; that the Zionist engaged in furthering the renaissance of the Jewish people in Palestine must necessarily be a less active and devoted citizen than the Gentile; that the Zionist cannot think of his whole future as bound up in the State of which he is citizen. Criticism of this kind raises the fundamental political question of the amount of individuality which is compatible with the character of a State. How much of his own personality must the citizen surrender to the State, and how much variety and divergence can the State tolerate among its citizens?

It raises also the question how much group life is permissible within the State, how far the State must rest upon a single nationality. The first of these questions occupied the attention of the Greeks over 2,000 years ago; the second has had an urgent interest for less than 150 years.

Plato advocated the extreme of homogeneity among the citizens of the State:—

Do we know then of any greater evil to the State than that which should tear it asunder and make it into a multitude of states instead of one? Or of any higher perfection than that which should bind it together, and make it one? Well, then, does not a community of feeling in pleasure and pain bind the citizens together when they all, so far as is possible, rejoice and grieve alike, at the same gains and the same losses? And does not isolation in these feelings produce disunion, when some are much pleased and others equally grieved at the same events affecting the city and its inhabitants? And does not this state of things arise when the words "mine" and "not mine" are not pronounced by all simultaneously in the city? And when there is the same discrepancy in the use of the word "another's"? That city is best conducted in which the largest proportion of citizens apply the words "mine" and "not mine" similarly to the same objects. Or in other words, that city which comes nearest to the condition of an individual man.

In the ideal State, therefore, all citizens feel alike, think alike, have the same tastes and the same interests, and Plato logically claims as a supreme expression of this unity community of wives and property. Probably no man to-day would have

the courage or perhaps the philosophic consistency to put the claim for unity and homogeneity as high as the Platonic ideal, but the same ideas and assumptions really underly the suggestion that Zionism and good citizenship are incompatible. It is assumed, as a kind of self-given verity requiring no demonstration, that all citizens ought to be very much alike, and no attempt is made or even thought necessary to investigate the limits within which citizens of the same State may differ in outlook. There was a time when this attitude expressed itself in a ruthless persecution of any departure from the orthodox or the norm, but to-day this active intolerance seldom scourges our world except in the course of a grave crisis in the fortunes of the State.

Aristotle, with his keen commonsense, saw the danger and the fallacy of the Platonic ideal of uniformity and homogeneity :

If the city is contracted too much, it will be no longer a city, for that necessarily supposes a multitude ; so that if we proceed in this manner we shall reduce a city to a family, and a family to a single person ; for we admit that a family is one to a greater degree than a city, and a single person than a family ; so that if this end could be obtained it should never be put in practice, as it would annihilate the city, for a city does not only consist of a large number of inhabitants, but these must also be of different sorts ; for were they all alike there could be no city.

The worship of excessive homogeneity among the citizens of a State is not only the pursuit of a mirage, it also reverses the true order of values. The individual does not exist for the State, but the State for the individual. The State itself, the apparatus of government, is only the machinery which is employed by society for its purposes ; and society is a fellowship of free individuals, which enables them to develop their individuality to its fullest and highest. The fallacy of deifying the State, the machine of government, and of treating it as an end in itself and of giving it absolute rights over the individual is the fallacy which in the current political jargon is called "Prussianism." It is natural enough that the anti-Zionist, Jew or Gentile, should drink in thought from the springs of "Prussianism." Society is necessary because, in the pregnant epigram of Aristotle, the man who can live in absolute solitude must be either a God or a beast. It is in and through society that individuality flowers ; but here again society is justified by individuality, not individuality by society. We may, therefore, reverse the order in which the imaginary critic of Zionism puts things, and say that it is not upon the individual citizen that the necessity of defending himself rests for any

variation from the norm of orthodoxy, but upon society and the State for any frowning upon such variation. When society and the State pass from frowning to persecution their case must be still stronger and clear from all doubt if they are to be justified. They must make out beyond confutation that the citizen against whom they are moving because of his difference from the majority is in the Aristotelian sense a "beast" (since he cannot be a God), that is, a man whose individuality has taken such a perverse course that it is not only corrupt in itself but corrupts society and prevents or hinders the other citizens from developing their individuality freely and nobly.

Can it be said that the Zionist is such a "beast"? The question has only to be put to answer itself. But the Zionist has no need to rest in this negative attitude. He claims that by virtue of his Zionism he is the better able to live that good life the encouragement of which is the moral justification of society, to perform his duties as a citizen, and to enrich the society of which he is a member with the truest kind of wealth—spiritual variety and strength. There is a certain minimum of obligations which must be performed by all citizens—the payment of taxation, the duty in certain eventualities of assuming arms, some participation in public affairs. Beyond this there is a large margin in which the citizen may select freely, and it is the use which he makes of this liberty of selection that determines the spirit in which he performs the indispensable minimum. One man may be interested in art, another in science, another in religion, another in exploration, another in history, another in sociology. This man may be a liberal, that a conservative, that a socialist. The roads to good citizenship are many and various. The Zionist can and does perform the indispensable minimum of obligation imposed by his British citizenship. His Zionism is concerned with that wide margin beyond the minimum, and it is a dedication which enables him to perform that minimum in a spirit which is of exceptional value to the State. Zionism is an ideal, and devotion to an ideal beyond selfishness and beyond materialism is a first-rate school of citizenship. Zionism is penetrated by the spirit of Judaism, and the central principle of Jewish ethics is Justice, and the central principle of Jewish judgment is the supremacy of reason. Justice and reason—these are the dynamic forces in the life of society which transform it steadily and irresistibly from violence and barbarism to equity and dignity, and by confirming and extending the empire of man over matter and magic give him the high fearlessness, the imperturbability, the confidence and the

hope through which individuality flourishes and secures its freedom.

Even on a narrower interpretation of politics the Zionist has a notable offering to bring to the life of the society and the State in which he is a partner. He is a nationalist, but a nationalist purged by his faith, his experience, and the accumulated instinct of a people which through thousands of years has watched the fall of empires and the withering of the dead-sea fruit of material power and oppression, from the perilous illusions of Chauvinism. He knows that the life of the individual must be lived in society, but he also knows that the life of no society can be healthy which indulges in the violent repression of other societies. This nationalism and the large vision which appreciates it are the hope of civilisation. Here and there throughout the world we find individuals and groups of individuals who have risen to this conception, but it may be claimed without exaggeration that there is no people other than the Jews whose nationalism takes this fine and pure form. Zionism, therefore, is a political discipline of very high positive value, and it cultivates a type of citizenship the need of which to the world was never more bitterly obvious than during a war which is largely the offspring of those very false doctrines and false ambitions of which Zionism can sterilise the mind.

But, it may be argued, if we admit the right of the individual Jew to be a Zionist, how can the growth of a nationalist group of Jews be suffered by a State or society which is not itself Jewish? The answer—that what is right for the individual is right for the group of individuals—is easy but not satisfactory; for a nationality is not simply x times the number of individuals. The whole is greater than its parts; it is different qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Before, however, offering a more satisfactory answer, it is well to point out that the problem in practice differs from country to country. In countries like England and France, for example, the Jews are few in numbers and the question of their developing a Jewish culture in substitution for instead of in addition to the culture of the country in which they live is hardly likely to arise at all, and certainly not within any period of which we need now take account. In countries like Russia, Austria-Hungary, and, the supreme instance, Turkey, it is either already an actual question or one which may very soon become actual. It should be noticed, however, that these are precisely the States in which there is a general problem of nationalities, of which from the government point of view the Jewish problem is only an element.

The ideal of the unitary, homogeneous State—that is, of a State inhabited by people of one nationality, speaking one language, exhibiting one culture, and perhaps professing to belong to one racial stock—underlies most of modern political thinking and is accepted usually as an axiom which ought not to be questioned. Yet it is a modern enough phenomenon. The ancient world, with its far-flung, loosely knit empires, a mosaic of peoples, knew nothing of it, and even Rome never achieved it in practice, still less adopted it as a dogma of statecraft. In the Middle Ages the ideal of religious uniformity haunted the minds of rulers, but religious unity rested not on the conception of the nation-state but on the conception of a universal or at any rate a European Christian Commonwealth. The mediæval State, if it had any culture at all, can hardly be said to have had a national culture, and indeed there were then properly speaking no nations. The Reformation and the development of centralised monarchies, by laying emphasis on unity and uniformity as constituents of political power, brought the notion of the unitary, homogeneous State a little nearer to the consciousness of political philosophers, and it might be thought that it was implicit in the teaching of such a man as Hobbes. But the political speculation of these centuries turned upon the question of sovereignty, that is, upon the ultimate authority in the State. The writers were concerned to assert or deny the right of the sovereign to command the absolute obedience of the subject, but the notions of common race, common tongue and common culture were quite foreign to their world of thought, although in a sense their discussions were preparing the way for them. One slight illustration will show how far the eighteenth century was in this matter from the nineteenth. The classical example of the centralised monarchy and the uniform State in the eighteenth century was France; yet Strasbourg, one of the great cities of France, was the premier university of German culture, and it was the intensely German sympathies of Strasbourg which induced the youthful Goethe to break with the French language and French models and dedicate himself to German. It is possible that the influence of Rousseau had no little to do with changing the form of political thought, but it was the French Revolution which was the decisive factor.

One of the leading motives of French revolutionary thought was “the Republic one and indivisible.” The aggression of Republican and Imperial France, again, provoked a nationalist revival and a nationalist reaction, and one strain of this reaction was romanticism, which found its fullest expression in

Germany as a glorification of the specifically national literature and culture of the Germanic past. One result of these various forces, coupled with the desire of rulers to develop the politico-military power of their dominions to the maximum, was the rise of the ideal of the unitary, homogeneous national State. It is curious to note that so unquestioned was the dogma for many years that liberal and reactionary alike paid homage to it. This is to be explained by the circumstance that in a rough fashion it fitted the most urgent practical need of the day. The most insistent political problem for the time being was, in fact, to redeem the fragments of peoples from alien rule or alien influence and unite them to form national States. But this formula had two serious defects. It gave warrant to the violent suppression of minorities (Poles, French and Danes in Germany for example), and it did not meet the case of the nationalities in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, who were too scattered to be constituted into compact homogeneous States.

The first writer of eminence to call in question the whole doctrine of the homogeneous nation-state was Lord Acton. Sixty years ago he said "The combination of different nations in one State is as necessary a condition of civilised life as the combination of men in society. It is in the cauldron of the State that the vigour, the knowledge, the capacity of one portion of mankind may be communicated to another. If we take the establishment of liberty for the realisation of moral duties to be the end of civil society, we must conclude that those States are substantially the most perfect which, like the British and Austrian Empires, include various distinct nationalities without oppressing them. The coexistence of several nations under the same State is a test as well as the best security of freedom. It is also one of the chief instruments of civilisation, and as such it is in the natural and providential order, and indicates a state of greater advancement than the national unity which is the ideal of modern liberalism."

It cannot be said that these profound words secured much attention, but the history of the last sixty years, culminating in the colossal havoc now devastating the world, is largely a comment on Lord Acton's text and a demonstration of its wisdom. The simple truth is that the worst political crimes of two generations have been committed under the inspiration of that doctrine of the unitary nation-state which underlies the particular objection to Zionism now being examined.

To a rigorous inquiry that doctrine rests on the fallacy of making the State an end in itself, to which society and the individual must be sacrificed. The State is simply the machine

of government; it is an apparatus which society, or the fellowship of men, needs for its purposes, but which ought to be entirely subordinated to those purposes and may be reshaped at will to express them. Those who make the State an end in itself are naturally led to conceive its distinguishing attribute to be power, and to sacrifice society and the citizen to the pursuit of power. We call this mode of thought "Prussianism," but the fact that a pamphlet on Zionism addressed to the English-speaking peoples should have to expose it is evidence that its adherents, conscious or unconscious, are not confined to Germany. The end of society is, to adopt Lord Acton's words, the establishment of liberty for the realisation of moral duties. The State or apparatus of government can be so devised as to accommodate itself to the needs of a society which includes various groups of nationalities, each with its own distinctive culture but all living together in harmony. Not only it can, but where required it must, for such a society is a higher social form than the unitary national society. It embraces a greater wealth and variety and a richer interchange of mind and opinion, and in that more comprehensive commonwealth of men the treasures of progress are accumulated more swiftly and more surely. This is not simply a theoretical speculation. The great war is the result of a failure to recognise its truth, and the great war has made its recognition the most urgent of political problems. We may, therefore, assert that the claim of Zionists and Zionism to recognition, so far from being a demand which conflicts with the rights of society, is in harmony with the soundest political theory and practice, and that in admitting it the State is not merely conceding what is their due to Jews, but is enriching the life of the society as a whole over which it rules and is thereby acting in the best interests of all its citizens.

It is at once fascinating and hazardous to speculate on the nature of the world which will crystallise out after the torment of the war. Whatever view may be taken of the origins of the conflict, it has this characteristic peculiar to itself: every one of the belligerents avows permanent peace to be the end he is seeking, and every one proclaims the sanctity of the principle of nationality. The wisdom of the world will exact from the rulers a measure of loyalty to their professions, and it will also aim at developing the true meaning of phrases not always used with a full sense of their implications. Public men are still employing too loosely and too servilely the phraseology of 19th century nationalism, which sets the unitary homogeneous single-nation State as its ideal, and which in effect is concerned much more with the machinery of power

and government (associated naturally with the State) than with those spiritual values which make up the true worth of society and justify its title to a free life. This narrow and false political conception has, of course, given the world some good things, but it has also bred the scourge of Imperialism, which, whether revealed as the outrages of bands in Macedonia or as the repression of the nationalities in Germany and Russia, or countries nearer home, goes back to the same essential vice of thought. Many of the reconstructions now ventured on paper show no appreciation of this central error, but the facts will prove too strong. There can be no abiding peace in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, nor indeed in Central and Western Europe, unless it be recognised that State and nationality are not convertible terms, but that on the contrary the State may include several nationalities each enjoying its own life, that many States must include several such nationalities, and that all are, from the standpoint of humanity and civilisation, the better for this variety and multiplicity. Zionism not only lies along the line of this development of the world, but it is calculated to play no contemptible part in stimulating progress along that line. True, considered by the measure of material power Zionists and Zionism may be of little moment, but the world is sick unto death with material power. What it needs is just thinking, a true idea. A little people is as apt as a numerous one to bring out and to teach a true idea, and no people is so well qualified as the Jews to bring out, to develop, and to teach the truth as to nationalism. We have lived through all the fevers of the ages, and have learnt from the experiences of others and from our own sufferings the futility of the imaginings and the vanity of the dreams of intolerance and Chauvinism. The Jewish Society we aim at recreating in Palestine will not merely demand freedom for itself or concede it to other nationalities; the breath of its life will be mutual understanding and co-operation between nationalities. Thus by example as by precept Zionism will contribute to that wise political reconstruction which is one of the keys to peace.

There is in conclusion perhaps one other anti-Zionist argument which deserves brief notice. It has been said that Jews in this country received emancipation on the implied or expressed undertaking of abandoning their Jewish nationalism, and that Jews in England to-day are bound by that undertaking so long as they retain the full rights of citizenship. One may take leave to doubt whether emancipation was granted on the strength of any such undertaking, and still more emphatically whether Englishmen to-day regard us

as holding it on such terms. If it is true that the Jewish advocates of emancipation used such an argument, it is also true that many a good cause is fought for and won by very mixed and dubious argument. To attempt to tie this nonsense of the Jewish advocates of emancipation as a yoke round the necks of Jews for all time is something too grotesque in logic—especially when it is remembered that not more than a handful of Jews now living in England are descended from those who won emancipation. We may say with Rousseau: “Even if each person could alienate himself he could not alienate his children; they are born free men; their liberty belongs to them, and no one has a right to dispose of it except themselves.” To the Jew who ventures to tell us that fifty years ago our birthright was surrendered our answer can be brief and strong. No Gentile ventures it. But, indeed, any such pretension rests upon that very “Prussian” theory of the State, the bitter fruits of which the world is now garnering. It will be one of the services of Zionism to have contributed to the liberation of the world from this error.



Zionism and the Jewish Religion.

IT is clear from the very fundamentals of both Zionism and the Jewish religion that the two are indissolubly connected together, for each claims that the Jewish people has a separate individuality of its own, which each in its own way desires to preserve; they differ only in laying stress on different phases of this individuality. The unit of Zionism is the Jewish people, and the most characteristic possession of the Jewish people is Judaism or the Jewish religion. The relationship is so natural, simple and obvious that it is in a high degree surprising that it should be so strangely misunderstood by many who claim to speak for each, and it will be of some interest to consider the cause of this misunderstanding, which has been greatly harmful both to Zionism and to Judaism, producing incomplete Zionists, who think Zionism possible without Judaism, and incomplete Jews, who think Judaism possible deprived of its historic national foundations. A minor cause of the misunderstanding may be traced to the statement of Zionism which was formulated at the first Zionist Congress, usually known as the Basle Programme: "Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by legal guarantees." But this statement merely embodies a *programme*, and is not and does not pretend to be a *definition* of Zionism, which is something far more fundamental.

There is, however, a deeper cause for the widespread misunderstanding as to the true relations that exist between Zionism and Judaism, a cause that is on the one hand inherent in the

very nature of Judaism and on the other hand arises from the historic circumstances of the Jewish people. Much confusion will be avoided if we make ourselves clear as to what precisely is meant by the phrase "Jewish religion." Analogies with the use of the word "religion" by non-Jews are liable to be seriously misleading, because from the current non-Jewish standpoint Judaism is not at all that which is usually conveyed by the words "a religion." In this popular sense religion is not an integral and necessary—though it may be a very desirable—part of life, it is something which enters into or is added to life, already more or less complete without it. The life, say, of an ordinary Englishman is made up of certain personal, family, and communal activities: exercising the normal functions of living, following a calling, rearing a family, social intercourse, political activity and participation, perhaps, in some intellectual or artistic interests. In addition, he may be a Christian; that is, have certain religious beliefs and practices, which, to be sure, may and should influence his life, but without which he can still be a complete and even a high type of Englishman. In other words, religion and nationality are distinct entities; they may be concurrent and interwoven, they may profoundly react on one another, but they yet remain separate aspects of life. Not so in Judaism. Here religion and life, religion and nationality, are identical, and their identity, which is an outcome, as we shall see later, of the Jewish conception of life, must be accepted as a definite historic truth, explicable as a result of definite historic causes.

These causes may be summed up briefly in the statement that although in ancient Israel, as in other primitive peoples, the conception of God was largely, if not completely, national, the broadening of the conception to a universalistic God-idea took place side by side and keeping pace with the growth of the national consciousness. As the national life expanded, so its religious basis expanded, and to this day the two have remained one and indivisible. The external position of religion in the modern Christian European state, if largely arising from the personal, individualistic nature of Christianity, must no less be ascribed to the fact that the change from belief in the primitive native gods to Christianity was an artificial

one, and not a natural process of growth ; the people of Europe took over bodily from another people a universal God whom their fathers had not known, who had not grown up with them from the childhood of their race, and in consequence the line of national development ceased to run parallel to the line of religious development, and religion became, as it remains to-day, a thing separate and apart, a matter of individual concern, no longer an inseparable part of the national consciousness. Wellhausen has said truly that the foundation upon which Israel's sense of its national unity rested was religious in its character. This was so in the beginning and throughout all the ages of Jewish history, and it is true now as always. Judaism, then, is no "religion" in the non-Jewish sense ; it is a way of life, the way of life of the Jewish people, expressive of and inspired by a particular conception of God. In this sense it has a "religious" basis, but the basis is inseparable from the structure, and Judaism is the indissoluble combination of the two.

When the Jewish people lived a national life on its own soil, its way of life, its Judaism was complete and self-contained, because it included all the elements necessary for the formation of a whole, healthy life. What is not usually realised is that for many centuries after the destruction of the Jewish State, indeed up to the era of emancipation, Jews continued to live a nationalistic life, for it was a life that was complete in itself, it was a life that was entirely Jewish, and it was homogeneous. For a great part of the period, too, it never lacked one or more spiritual centres—the Patriarchate and the schools of Palestine, the Prince of the Captivity and the schools of Babylonia, the great centres of learning in Spain, North Africa, France, and the Rhineland, centres from which guidance and light spread over the whole Diaspora, welding the separate units of the House of Israel into one people. True, this life, complete as it was in itself, was not a national life in the fullest sense of the term, for it lacked some of the larger elements that only freedom of growth can produce. It was a restricted and in later times even a stunted life ; in the end it was a Ghetto life. But Jewish and national it was always, because Judaism embraced it all, inspiring every motive and guiding every act.

The question is sometimes asked: why is it, if Zionism is so essential to Judaism, that none of the great Jewish teachers of the past have laid down as an obligation binding upon all Jews the duty of fostering the national sentiment and endeavouring to establish in Palestine the realisation of that sentiment? From the considerations urged above the answer will be apparent. In Judaism as understood by the Rabbis of the Talmud or the codifiers of the middle ages the nationalistic element was tacitly implied. To them a Judaism which did not embrace the total life of the Jewish people would have been inconceivable. It is true that the later Codes, the *Tur** and the *Shulchan Aruch*** accepted, and even appeared to treat as a norm, the restricted Jewish life of their day; but the great code of Maimonides, following the Talmud itself, included and treated the laws regulating the Jewish State established in Palestine (*Hilchoth Malchuth* "the Laws of the Kingdom") as an integral and essential part of the Torah,† as if without it the Torah would be incomplete. To the Rabbis, greater than the calamity of exile to the Jewish people was the loss of a home for Judaism (*galuth ha-Shechinah*), of a land where Judaism could be lived in all its fulness and all its depth.

So long then as the Jewish people lived a Jewish life, even when that life was a narrow life, the nationalistic aspect of Judaism was *ipso facto* implied, and to state it in so many words was as unnecessary as it was for R. Joseph Caro to open the *Shulchan Aruch* with an injunction to Jews to believe in the existence of God. Beliefs, as Dr. Schechter says, even essential beliefs, have only to be asserted when there is necessity to assert them. It is the new conditions that have come into being since the era of emancipation that require us now to assert positively and to emphasise and energise the nationalistic aspect of Judaism. For what does emancipation mean to the Jew? It means that the larger life which the new conditions permit him to lead, full participation in all the activities of the life surrounding him, cannot be completely Jewish. His life may in truth for a time be inspired by and permeated with Jewish ideals, but unless there is going to be an extremely powerful back-pull to hold him

* A code of Jewish law compiled by R. Jacob b. Asher in the 14th century.

** A compilation of the 16th century consisting of a text by R. Joseph Caro and running annotations by R. Moses Isserles.

† For a definition of this term, see p. 18.

attached to the Jewish foree-centre, the emancipated Jew must yield in the end to the attractions of other great cultures and life-forees; at the best he will be bound to live something of a double life, attempting to follow simultaneously two different ideals; at the worst he will succumb and abandon Judaism entirely. The dietary laws, the Sabbath, the holy Jewish home life, all the historic bonds of unity and sanctity will one by one disappear—they are fast disappearing—and with them must go in the end the last shreds of Jewish thought and feeling.

The Rabbis tell us that God never creates an ill without first creating its cure. If emancipation contains within itself seeds of decay for Judaism, it no less creates conditions that make it possible for Judaism to rejuvenate itself in a way impossible in times of oppression. In the middle ages the dream of Zion calling back her sons and daughters from afar, the dream of the mount of the House of the Lord established upon the top of the mountains, when the Torah will go forth from Zion, was an ideal the realisation of which could only be projected into a far-distant future, to hope for which in the immediate present would have betokened the madness born of uncontrolled despair. How then could the Halaehists* teach that to strive for a home in Palestine was a duty incumbent upon every Jew? If emancipation has at first brought with it the dangers of spiritual slavery hidden beneath the dazzling light of physical freedom, it has at least given us that freedom by which and in which, if we only choose to use it aright, we can regain into our own hands the determination of our destiny, can win for the Jewish soul the larger freedom without which mere political emancipation is a lure to ultimate destruction. "There is no freedom except the Torah," say the Rabbis; the freedom of the soul to realise its highest possibilities in harmony with the will of God; and this we Jews can only look to find in a free Jewish community in Palestine, where Judaism will have the opportunity, while utilising the best it has absorbed from outside, to work itself out in its own way freely, unimpeded.

This possibility of realising the larger nationalism is the offer which Zionism makes to the Jewish people. That all Jews can or will avail themselves of the opportunity to live a complete

* The Rabbis who taught practical Jewish law.

Jewish life is not to be expected, perhaps not even to be desired. A Diaspora there always must be, but a community of Jews living a full Judaism in Palestine will influence for good the scattered communities in the furthest corners of the globe, co-ordinating, vivifying, inspiring. Thus Zionism indicates the lines along which will be solved what has been for the past century the outstanding problem of practical Judaism—the provision of some substitute for the central authorities which in times past fixed the norm of Jewish practice. Now changes occurring in obedience to the national requirements in practices like those of Judaism, which express a national principle and reflect the national spirit, must be made by the people, and not, as is too often assumed, arbitrarily imposed by authority. The function therefore of a central authority is not, as a rule, to institute changes in law and practice, but rather to standardise and codify, as a basis for present observance and future stable development, such changes as have already become generally established as a result of new conditions and requirements, or have become necessary in the interests of Judaism as a whole. The people legislate; the legislators merely record; “they confirmed in Heaven what had been accepted by Israel on earth.”* In ages past such central authorities have been the Sanhedrin, the Patriarchate, the Talmudical Schools, and Rabbis of acknowledged pre-eminence, such as the authors of the *Shulchan Aruch*, whose authority has been accepted by the Israel of their generation. Judaism at the moment is perhaps in a state of too violent instability for a central authority to be of any avail, and in any case it is impossible to believe that any authority can in modern times exercise the sway that *Beth Din* (Rabbinical Court) or Code wielded in times gone by. And yet some standard Judaism must have, or it will perish through the very multitude of its varieties: “according to the number of thy cities are thy gods, O Judah.” It will be the function of the central settlement in Palestine to create and emit the unifying influence that is essential if Judaism is to remain one and to remain vital in face of the disintegrating, centrifugal forces of modern life, and it will effect this end in a way and in a degree that seem inconceivable by any other means.

* Talmud Megillah 7a.

The road is now clear for a somewhat closer consideration than has been given in the above general survey of our subject of the fundamental ideas of Zionism and Judaism and of the relation between them.

Zionism may be regarded as the expression of the unity of the Jewish people—its common origin, history, consciousness, aspirations, and ideals. It is the expression of Jewish collectivism and is a corollary of the duty which every Jew owes to his people. But it is something more than an idea. It is also the attempt to translate this ideal unity of the Jewish people into a real unity, centred in the soil of Palestine. Zionism then is founded first on the fact of the existence of a group of persons whose common history entitles them to be called a people, and secondly on the fact that this group of persons possesses common ideals, that the Jewish people in fact have had a spiritual history as well as a material history, and that they hope therefore for a spiritual future as well as for mere existence as a separate unit. What is meant by the phrase “national Jewish ideals” as used in this connection? A national ideal has a twofold meaning. It signifies in the first place any principle which underlies the manifestations of the national life. Further, it has reference to the conscious attempts to put such principles into practice, to live up to what they imply in every act of the individual and national life. In the case of the Jewish people the fundamental underlying principle of national life, which is never absent from any characteristic manifestation of the Jewish spirit, and which if ignored leaves Jewish history without a meaning, without an intelligible background, is the belief in a *particular conception of God*, a particular conception of the relation of the Jewish people to God, and with it a translation into practice of all that is implied by these conceptions. The principle and its application in the life of the Jewish people together constitute Judaism. Thus the relation of Zionism to Judaism is the relation of framework to content, of material to form. Zionism states that Jews collectively form a nation, even without the territorial basis; that there exists a Jewish national spirit, which its purpose is to stimulate and utilise. Judaism tells us what this spirit signifies and how it expresses itself in the life of the Jewish people. A Zionist whose interests are confined to the Jewish people, to

the exclusion of Judaism, is no true Zionist ; he is a materialist, believing only in substance and not in spirit, in the means and not in the end. The worth and value of a nation are not in its mere existence, but in what it as a nation stands for and produces. its cultural values, its outlook on life ; and the most characteristic and precious possession of the Jewish people is Judaism—what the Jewish people conceive to be the ways of God, what the Jewish people regard as the right way of life. Those Zionists who affect to ignore Judaism must not forget that even that narrow nationalism which is all they desire to cultivate is only possible in our time because of those elements in the traditional Jewish life which have directly fostered and kept alive the historic sense and the national consciousness. Where would have been now even this nationalism, were it not that Jews since their political existence ended have never ceased to celebrate year by year by unleavened bread and *Seder* Service, in a way that burned in them an ineradicable impression, the day which saw them born into the world a nation among the nations ; were it not that during the two thousand years since the destruction of the Temple they have never ceased to recall their past, mourn for its loss, and daily pray for a future that should bury the very memory of that calamity in the glories of a restored national life ; were it not that the Synagogue has kept alive the national tongue, and the study of the Torah the national ideals and the national hope ? It may be urged that these very practices are themselves expressions of that national spirit, and that to claim that they have kept alive the national feeling is to confuse the cause with the effect. But is it conceivable that any national expression would have endured the long agony of the exile had it not been for the bed-rock of religious faith on which the national life was founded, had it not been for the unconquerable belief that all had to be borne for the love of God, the Father of Israel and the Author of all he held dear ? A further consideration arises, and one too that is vital. Apart altogether from the theory that the traditional Jewish mode of life is an outcome of the Jewish national spirit, we have the fact that this life has succeeded, by immersing the Jewish people in a protective environment of its own, in warding off alien ideals and hostile cultures that would assuredly have destroyed both Jews and

Judaism had they come into too intimate contact with them. Are we sure that we in the Diaspora are no longer liable to hurt from these dangers, dangers that would be not in the slightest degree diminished if a national centre were established to-day in Palestine? We desire this centre not because Jews can now live without Judaism, but because they need *more* Judaism, Judaism that shall be a reality, a living thing with a heart at its old-new centre to drive the life-giving blood to every corner of the dispersion and restore to the worn limbs beauty, freshness and youth.

If the Zionist who will have nothing of Judaism is a danger to true nationalism as well as to Judaism, no less dangerous is the "religious" Jew who says that Zionism means nothing to his Judaism, for he is casting away the living organic medium, the nation through which alone Judaism expresses itself; he is throwing away the material structure which holds the precious content. This Judaism too must in the end perish, whether it take the form of Liberal Judaism and glide imperceptibly and unconsciously into Christianity, old or new, or whether it appear as that type of orthodoxy which loves Frankfort better than Jerusalem, and thus renders itself for ever bankrupt and sterile.

It may be objected that all this is a long way from the current accepted view of Judaism as a body of beliefs and laws arbitrarily imposed by God from without and given to Israel through law-giver, prophets and Rabbis. Now while it would be absurd to say that Judaism viewed from the modern standpoint, which if truly modern can only be that of the doctrine of physical causality and evolution, is identical in all respects with the traditional statement, yet it may be affirmed that the differences apparent in the two modes of expression by no means correspond to differences in underlying reality. In other words, the modern statement of Judaism indicated here does little more than put in more or less philosophical language what is set out in popular language in the traditional statement. Now while the traditional *theory* of Judaism postulates an unchangeable Divine Torah as the guide to life for all time, the traditional *practice* of Judaism places the interpretation and the application of that Torah in the hands of the accredited representatives of the people of Israel, in the

last resort under the authority of "the collective conscience of Catholic Israel."* While, then, the Torah in principle is based on an abstract, objective, eternal standard of right and wrong conduct, having its seat and origin in God, the Torah in practice, obeying the natural laws of causality and development, adapts itself just like a living organism to its environment, to the progressive demands of an ever-expanding Jewish consciousness**, and in so doing passes from an arbitrary external command to become an outward expression of an inner national spirit; a law from within, written upon Israel's heart.† "For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off but the word is very nigh unto thee; in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."††

The phrase "the Jewish spirit" translated into theistic language, means God the underlying Spirit of the universe manifesting himself in the Jewish people. The Spirit of God can be denied to no people or person‡, but the Jewish people claims on grounds that can be historically justified to have a deeper, truer, higher manifestation of God than is to be found in any other people. Israel is not only a nation; it is also "a holy nation," or, if it is preferred to put it so, Israel is nearer to God, and therefore God is nearer to Israel; "ye shall be a special possession unto me from among all peoples."‡‡

The difference between ancient and modern ways of conceiving religious ideas turns largely on the extent to which anthropomorphic modes of expression are made use of. These are to the modern mind, after thousands of years of religious development and philosophic training, often distasteful and

* See the Introduction to Schechter's "Studies in Judaism" (Series 1).

** Liberal Judaism professes too to be a natural development; but in reality it is nothing of the kind. Its growth is determined not by the inner necessities of Judaism and the Jewish people but by external circumstances. It does not therefore *grow* in the organic sense, since it disobeys the principle of continuity in space and time; it merely *changes*—a radically different process from organic growth. It is idle to speculate as to the course development is likely to take as a result of a new living centre of Judaism in Palestine. From the standpoint taken here radical changes are unlikely, for Jewish life in its essence expresses eternal verities. In spite of very considerable and even very important differences between the traditional Judaism of to-day and that of, say Rashi and the Mishnah and the Pentateuch, the outstanding features of Jewish life remain the same as they always have been, and they are likely to continue the same.

† Jeremiah xxxi. 32.

†† Deut. xxx., 11-14.

‡ In Rabbinic phraseology. "The good of all nations share in the world to come."

‡‡ Exod. xix., 5.

unsatisfying, and it cannot be doubted that the more one is able to dispense with them the nearer will be the approach to a statement that approximates to absolute truth. Moreover, the mind of the ancient Hebrew was able to realise in an almost inconceivably vivid fashion the existence and presence of God, who to him was far more of a reality than is the material world to us. Consequently it appeared to him no incongruity to state religious experiences in the homely language of daily life—"the Torah speaks in the language of human beings." But we moderns have now for many centuries been concentrating our intellectual faculties on the study of the physical universe, which to us is almost the only real universe. Where we speak of proximate causes the ancient Hebrews spoke of ultimate causes, ascribing directly to God all the occurrences even of daily life. For those of us who believe that materialism is not an ultimate explanation of the world, the definition of spiritual things in terms of material things is often more likely to obscure than to elucidate what we feel to be the truth. Hence, while generally and popularly it is necessary still to express religious experiences in the language of our fathers, it sometimes becomes valuable to us of this day in particular, to clear ourselves absolutely, or at least as far as one humanly can, from anthropomorphic standards of value. We have only to do this to see how clearly what we are pleased to call the modern way of looking at religious ideas approximates to the highest conceptions of Judaism, as stated for example by Maimonides. Maimonides above all Jewish thinkers regards God as absolute; he goes so far, when he is in his highest philosophic mood, as to refuse to postulate any positive attributes whatsoever in regard to the Godhead, and he finally defines God in terms of negative attributes only. If we adopt this as the ultimate Jewish standpoint, we must conclude that when any relationship between God and man is spoken of, the process of change implied in such relationship can be referred to man only and not to God. A revelation from God to man, then, put into the language of philosophical theism, means a particular state of mind on the part of man, by which he is brought into some sort of special but indefinable contact with the Absolute perfection called God. The prophets, sages, and saints of Israel, who have been in the old language the vehicles

of revelation, become in the new language those in whom the soul of the Jewish people, which is one aspect of the spirit of God, has most mightily manifested itself.

This conception of Israel's national destiny, of a special relationship between God and the people of Israel, which only imposes upon it higher duties because the national sense of God in Israel is truer than that of other peoples, finds its classic expression in the Book of Amos. The history of Israel is neither more nor less a part of the Divine plan than is the history of any other nation: "Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Aramaeans from Kir?" (ix. 7) But Israel has known God as no other nation has known him, and it must take the consequences of that knowledge for good or for evil: "Only you have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore will I visit upon you all your iniquities" (iii. 2).

Viewed in this light the Torah, which is the life of Israel, is the natural expression of the national consciousness possessed by the Jewish people of this special relationship between them and God. As the relationship is what may be called a "natural" one, one obeying the laws of causality, and not an arbitrary one, so is the law expressing that relationship a natural and not an arbitrary mode of expression.* It is not the law which the master imposes upon the slave; rather is it the loving covenant that obtains between man and wife: "And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me *ishi* (my husband) and shalt call me no more *baali* (my master)." (Hosea ii. 16.)

The well-known Rabbinical legend based on Deut. xxxiii. 2 indicates that the Rabbis, who might by some be expected above all people to hold the rigid, mechanical view of Judaism, well realised that life under the Torah was in harmonious accord with the genius of the Jewish national spirit. The story relates how God first offered the Law to Seir, but he, Edom, refused it because his way of life was to live by the sword (Gen. xxvii. 4). God then offered it to Ishmael, but he too refused it, because he was to live by plunder and robbery (Gen. xvi. 12). Only

* Hebrew has no exact equivalent of the word "obey." The word *sh'ma'*, meaning to hear, understand, and then to hearken, itself suggests some spiritual harmony between him who commands and him who accepts. The Torah is constantly spoken of as a Covenant (*b'rith*) between God and Israel.

in Israel could a nation be found able and willing to accept the gift.

It was left to the Jewish philosophers of the eighteenth century, Mendelssohn and his school, to fail utterly to understand the national basis of Judaism and to substitute for the natural conception of Judaism and of the relation between God and Israel the theory that Judaism was a dogma-less "religion," a revealed code of laws, and Jews merely a "religious" brotherhood. It was perhaps inevitable that this should be so, seeing that Mendelssohn was after all but a child of his age. It was an age that had been dazzled by the splendid triumphs of the Newtonian philosophy and had been led thereby into a passing phase of deism, perhaps the most sterile and unconvincing of all forms of cosmic philosophy. The discoveries of Newton and his great French successors seemed to offer so complete and all-embracing an explanation of the universe that it came to be looked upon as a piece of perfect mechanism, which, once brought into being by the Creator, had simply to have his *laws imposed upon it* to enable it to run on alone for ever, or until his fiat should end it. Mendelssohn unconsciously applied this eighteenth-century conception of law, as something real, objective, and apart, arbitrarily imposed from without, to explain what he regarded as the legalistic system of Judaism, and in so doing, losing sight of the part played in the process by the national genius of Israel, he missed altogether what was fundamental, namely the inseparable attachment of the Jewish religion to the Jewish nationality. It was an age, too, of universalism, of generous spirits looking forward to the not far distant time when the brotherhood of man was to break down the barriers of nations; and it would have seemed then a poor service to render to Judaism, with its universalistic prophetic ideals of all the families of the earth banded together in peace and brotherhood to serve their Creator with a single mind, to limit its teachings, as it would have appeared, to a single people and degrade its God from Creator of Heaven and Earth to become once more a mere tribal deity. The higher nationalism, co-operative nationalism as against competitive nationalism, was as yet scarcely understood. The notion of the mechanical unity of the Universe taught by the Newtonian

philosophy made men forget that in the higher unity must be infinite variety, and the idea that individuality in national characteristics was a good in itself, so long as its fruits were all fed into the common stock, was as yet dimly understood by even the deepest thinkers. In this way arose the doctrine of the Mission of Israel, which set out to prove that nationalism in Israel was but a bygone step in the march of humanity towards a universal religion, and that the true destiny of the Jew was to be sought not in his developing his own full national life on the ancient soil, but in his being scattered among the peoples, there to teach the unity of God and his demands for a righteous life. I would not aver that this doctrine is altogether false, for the Jews in the Diaspora have unquestionably a function to fulfil in maintaining before the world a high type of life, but, as Ahad Ha'am has so acutely pointed out, the prophet* does not say that Israel is to go down among the nations to teach the ways of God, but that the nations shall say "Come ye, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob."

It is by no means easy to define precisely in modern language what one means when one speaks of the principle, the particular conception of God, for which the Jewish people stands, but it may be taken crudely to be belief in the existence of an Absolute Reality in whom are embodied certain fundamental transcendental qualities, each *sui generis* and definable in no other terms—truth, holiness, justice, qualities that may be regarded as the *national values* of the Jewish people. These qualities are absolute and transcendental; that is to say, they are something outside and independent of man, but in their perfection as embodied in God they are the goal of all human intellectual, spiritual and ethical endeavour. "After the Lord your God shall ye walk and him shall ye fear and his commandments shall ye keep and to his voice shall ye hearken and him shall ye serve and to him shall ye cleave."**

The Jewish people has realised the existence of these qualities and their ultimate seat in God more clearly than has any other people, and the statement of this principle and its application

* Isaiah ii. 2 and 3.

** Deut. xiii. 5. See also the Rabbinical interpretation thereon (*Sotah* 14a), "How can man follow after God? Only by imitating his attributes." In a remarkable passage in his code (*Hilchot Deot* i. 5) Maimonides states that the prophets ascribed attributes to God in order to indicate to man the way he should go.

to and manifestation in life constitute Judaism. The history of Israel has been the history of Judaism, and it has been, stripped of accessories and non-essentials, one long struggle against idolatry. Baal and the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, Hellenism, Christianity ancient and modern; these were the antagonists who would express the idea in concrete form. Paganism, naturalism, materialistic monism; these were and are the enemies who deny the very existence of the Idea. The contact with and the fight against every successive opposing or retarding force have been so many steps in the upward struggle of the Jewish spirit to express itself, to conquer, to survive. Bible and Talmud and the rest of our literature, the Bible to a supreme degree, record the struggle of the national Idea and its expression in the infinite manifoldness of life for our help and our guidance and this is the secret of their abiding worth.

Judaism, then, expresses in life the striving towards these three ethical entities which find their completion in God; truth, holiness and justice. Nothing more than a passing glance can be given to the historical evidence for the truth of this statement. We have only to turn to the two great sources of Judaism, Bible and Talmud, to find defined with the greatest clearness the three distinct phases of Jewish life which correspond with the three fundamental ethical qualities. In the Bible these phases may be described as, (1) The acquisition of Wisdom, embodying the idea of truth, (2) The Priestly ideal, embodying the idea of holiness*, (3) the Prophetic Ideal, embodying the idea of justice**. The Bible cannot, it is almost needless to add, be divided up into three watertight compartments, each dealing with the applications of one of the principles, but it can without difficulty be shown that every element of Old Testament teaching may be referred back to one or other of our basic principles, the whole woven into a threefold strand in which the elements are inextricably bound up one with the other. In the great passage in Deuteronomy (iv. 6-8) where the national characteristics of the ideal Israel are epitomised with unequalled force and grandeur, the three principles which these characteristics

* Summed up in the Law in the words "Ye shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy" (Levit. xix. 2).

** Summed up in the Law in the words "Justice, justice shalt thou pursue" (Deut. xvi. 20).

express are implied in each succeeding verse with exceptional clearness and directness.

For this is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the peoples, which shall hear all these statutes, and say "Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people."

For what great nation is there that hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is whensoever we call upon him?

And what great nation is there, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?

In the Rabbinical scheme of Jewish life we see no less clearly how the great subdivisions of duties under which the Rabbis class the demands of the Torah express in practical life our three fundamental spiritual qualities. These duties are (1) The study of the Torah (*Talmud Torah*)* (2) Duties between man and God, realising the principle of holiness (3) Duties between man and man, realising the principle of justice. Each of these groups embodies a national characteristic that is probably unique in the Jewish people (see again Deut. iv. 6-8 quoted above). What other scheme of life or religious system is there which regards the acquisition of knowledge as a primary duty and its possession as one of the greatest of ideals? Lest it be said that *Talmud Torah* refers only to a restricted kind of "religious" knowledge, the fact must be emphasised that the word "Torah" (see p. 18) in Hebrew is of the widest possible signification, embracing the whole scheme of Jewish teaching and life. These are the words of the very first supplicatory passage in the *Amidah*, the daily Jewish statutory prayer *par excellence*: "*Thou favourest man with knowledge, and teachest mortals understanding. O favour us with knowledge, understanding and discernment from thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, Gracious Giver of Knowledge.*"

In Judaism then, we have a type of life actually based on knowledge and therefore on reason, "*Understand, O Israel, know,* in order to live. Knowledge, therefore, is first and foremost of the Jewish national values.

The application of the second principle is no less unique; the idea of a people whose whole national life is consecrated to the service of God, not, be it emphasised, by withdrawing from

* Declared by the Rabbis to be the most fundamental of all duties: "*Talmud Torah* is equal to them all."

the world and living the life of the cloister, but by living in and with the good world which God has made.* A life so disciplined by constant reminders of its Divine origin and purpose, which, while it may end in certainly does not aim at happiness, can and has brought out and developed some of the noblest qualities inherent in the nature of man, for it sets up as a pattern an abstract ideal of life before which self-indulgence can barely endure. The principle all but solves the problem of civilised life, for this has no greater enemy than self-indulgence to contend against, whether it be the spiritual self-indulgence of that type of religion which would sacrifice all for the salvation of the individual soul, "the sad righteousness which seeks for gain," or the material self-indulgence that has perhaps more than anything else been responsible for the destruction of every successive wave of civilisation that has appeared upon the earth. This, then, the idea of life as something purposive, consecrated to an end in God, is the second Jewish national value. Among the Jewish practices which embody the principle and translate it into acts of life are the Sabbath, which expresses in a characteristically Jewish way Israel's protest against materialism and his belief in a Divine universe; the dietary laws, which are a visible embodiment of the striving for holiness; of course prayer, in one of its several aspects; and the laws of marriage, which sanctify the sexual instinct by consecrating it for the perpetuation of the holy people. No artificially-imposed duties are these, but acts of life expressing an appreciation of and a striving towards a principle.

The third of our national values is the conception of justice as the basis of all relations between man and man. This idea, and more particularly the application of it in the scheme of Jewish life, is unique too, even as are our other national values.

In Driver's Exodus the following little sentence occurs in the middle of the introduction to the code of laws (*Mishpatim*) contained in the twenty-first chapter of that book. "The promulgation of a new code of laws was often among ancient nations ascribed to the command of the national deity." Few non-Jewish modern Bible scholars have been more sympathetic to Judaism than was the late Canon Driver, and yet he here,

* Genesis i. 31.

quite unconsciously, touches on a vital issue which shows in a strikingly interesting manner how wide is the gulf dividing the Jewish from the modern Christian scheme of life. To the modern it is a piece of archæological curiosity that the origin of a legal code should be ascribed to God. The promulgation and administration of law is a matter for the Senate and the Courts, not a concern of the Church. In the Jewish concept of life the distinction is worse than mischievous, it is meaningless. From Bible times, when law-giver or priest delivered judgment at the Sanctuary, to the modern Rabbi or *Beth Din* whose decisions range from problems in ritual cases to questions arising out of every imaginable relationship between man and man, the Torah and its teaching, whether in origin or application, are regarded as the one, indivisible, all-embracing guide to Jewish life. For if the principle of holiness shows *why* to live, the principle of justice shows *how* to live. You may, if you like, call the one religious and the other secular, but in the Jewish view it is justice, telling man how to live with man and nation with nation, which is going to establish Heaven upon earth. Its realisation here is no subordinate, auxiliary phase of national activity, of interest to some handful of expert practitioners; it is an integral, essential and fundamental part of life, of the very essence of the Divine whence it originates and where it finds its ultimate completion: "righteousness and judgment are the foundation of his throne."* It is a national concern because it is a national concept, expressing in human relationships the soul of the Jewish people, which is God.

Judaism then is a type of life peculiar in its most characteristic aspects to a particular people, whose spiritual values, or, in other words, whose fundamental ideas about God and the world, it translates into practice through the medium of the national life. In Hebrew there exists no exact equivalent of the word "Judaism" or of the phrase "Jewish religion," but we have instead the wonderful, untranslatable word "Torah," and this at once both indicates and symbolises Israel's unique conception of God, life and duty. The primary meaning of Torah is direction; hence it comes to mean teaching, instruction or doctrine, either a particular teaching or a law on a given

* Psalm xcvii. 2.

subject, or a particular group of laws or a code of laws, such as the code in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut. i. 5 and iv. 44). Then it comes to mean the whole "written law" or Pentateuch, and finally in Rabbinical literature it stands for the whole body of Jewish law, written and traditional, and, still more, the whole body of Jewish teaching and practice—in a word, the whole Jewish way of life and thought. This Torah is the only "religion" that Judaism knows, and it has no meaning apart from the life of the people who live it. Not only the Torah, say the Rabbis, but Israel, too, was conceived before creation, aye, and the name of Messiah too, for Israel can only attain his highest when his soul is free to realise all its possibilities. The national conception must have its national basis, and it can only find its fullest expression in a free national life in the land which gave it birth—"there will I make thee a great nation"* , nurtured on the language which alone can reveal its meaning, amidst the memories of deeds and immortal thoughts that the world dare not leave unheeded, thoughts which for humanity's sake Israel is bound by every obligation of truth and honour to preserve and expand till they fill with their fruit the whole face of the earth.

* Genesis xii. 2.

Palestine and the Hebrew Revival.

THE sudden awakening of the consciousness of a people brings in its train the desire to conserve and to elaborate the mental and material characteristics of its culture,—the factors responsible for its past splendour and its persistence in time. There is perhaps no better example of such a phenomenon than the Revival of Jewish Nationalism. The Zionist movement of the present day was in its inception largely negative—rather a protest against Anti-Semitism, than a spiritual movement mirroring the soul of a people. But it acted as a stimulus to the dormant energies of Jewry. What was at first a reaction against a hostile external force, due to the instinct of self-protection, soon came into contact with the deeper currents of Jewish life, and set up movements in the whole body of the Jewish people. The current of Jewish consciousness, which had struggled through the Galuth of two thousand years, ruffled here and there by persecution, illumined at times by isolated genius, became in the light of Zionism and the National Revival—a limpid stream full of potentialities for the future. The Jew saw himself not merely as the butt of persecution, but as the living agent of a culture which had seemingly been brought to a dead stop with the extinction of the Jewish State and the closing of the Talmudic writings. In fact, however, the active flow of Jewish mentality has never suffered such an arrest. No

doubt, in the course of history alien cultures, made powerful by political ramparts, the back eddies of internal controversy, and religious persecution, have stemmed or diverted the stream. But, in spite of these retarding influences, the continuity of Jewish culture has remained, and the Jewish Nationalism of our own day finds itself at one with the whole of the Jewish past. The factors that have been responsible for this continuity have been the Jewish religious and ethical outlook, and literary culture, both of which have been embodied in the Hebrew language, and intimately tied up with our Palestinian past.

It may perhaps be urged that too much importance has been assigned to the share that Hebrew has had in the survival of Jewish culture. Why, it might be asked, should such emphasis be laid upon the language in which a culture has been embodied? Surely a spiritual revival should probe deeper than the skin, should find the fountain-head of its spiritual potency in factors more fundamental than those of language and environment. If it is the spirit that you desire to conserve, how is it possible to do so through Hebrew and Palestine? This criticism rests primarily upon a narrow conception of the relation between a language and the spirit which it expresses, and secondarily on a limited conception of Judaism. To separate a people and its culture from its language and from the environment in which it has developed is as hopeless a task as attempting to separate body from soul. "A hand cut off," said Aristotle, "is a hand no more." A language separated from the people that has moulded it is an empty form, like the interesting skeleton of a dead polyp. Further, a language is not used by a literary artist merely as a medium, for the medium itself plays an intimate part in determining the ultimate form and quality of the resulting work of literary art.

In the Middle Ages Latin was used as the language of scholars. Its vocabulary was eminently suited for carrying on theological and philosophical discussions. As a language it was used merely as a means of communication, rarely was it used with success as a means of expressing an artistic bent

or a spiritual outlook. Never has Hebrew descended to this level. Few would suppose that the Bible would possess its present value were it not for the fact that it is the expression of the Hebrew genius in the Hebrew language. The simplicity of the Hebrew language seems to run parallel with the singleness of the Semitic mind, and both no doubt owe much of this elemental character to their Palestinian environment. The austerity and simple grandeur of the Hebrew prophetic writings have much in common with the austerity of Palestinian scenery. The environment has moulded the spirit of the people, and the genius of the people in its turn has given form and colour to the language. It would require no little effort of abstraction to sunder these three. Nor does the attitude here adopted give a materialistic basis to the character of Jewish culture, for at the root the term "physical" is merely the name that we give to a certain part of our experience, and it is the expression in Literature, Art, Religion, and Social Institutions of a people's experience that constitutes its culture.

So far, then, as to the general importance of the relationship between a people, its language, and its land. Jewish history in particular, testifies to the importance of this relationship. Throughout the Middle Ages those classical works of Jewish literature that have influenced subsequent generations of Jews were either written in Hebrew or speedily translated into Hebrew. The outpourings of the Jewish soul in poetry and prose were potent influences in Jewry so long as they expressed the Jewish spirit in the language of the Jews. Kalir and Judah Halevi and the various *piyyutists* owed their success to the Hebrew language, to Hebrew thoughts, and to Hebraic aspirations. For this reason their writings have found a home in the synagogue, which in persecution remained the resting-place of the Jewish soul. It may be noted in this connection that the so-called "Spanish" period in Jewish history runs parallel with the scholastic period of the Christian World. But, whereas the literature of the Jews bore the stamp of Jewish genius, the Latin works of the Mediæval schoolmen, written in a dead tongue, bear, save

on the strictly intellectual side, no impress of either national or personal genius, and to-day the works of the Schoolmen are dead, while the writings of the Jewish thinkers and poets yet live with the people in whose language they are written.

Never till the development of the Jewish communities of Central Europe had the Hebrew genius found expression in any language but Hebrew. But with the end of the 16th century there arose the strange ease of the *Jüdisch* jargon. Here we find a language neither German, nor Polish, nor Hebrew, being used as a means of literary expression with conspicuous success. But can we regard *Jüdisch* as an entirely "foreign" language? Certainly not. The successful *Jüdisch* writings are Jewish writings, despite the undoubted Slavonic touches. *Jüdisch* testifies to the virility of the Jewish literary genius; it shows how the Jewish mind can impress something of its own individuality on a tongue originally alien. But if we look at *Jüdisch* from the point of view of the revival of the Jewish people we are forced to admit that it falls far short of what the Jewish national language should be. It bears the stamp of the Jewish genius, but the image is blurred and distorted. *Jüdisch* is a product of the *Galuth*, not of the free and unimpeded activity of the national spirit. And for that reason it has not and can never have that grip on the affections of the Jewish people which Hebrew possesses. It is but a makeshift.

Jüdisch has been carried from the continent of Europe across the seas to America, where a stronghold of the *Jüdisch* language exists, but this stronghold has only been held by the first generation of American Jews, those who had spent their early years in the Ghettoes of Poland and Galicia. With the rapid Americanising of the children of these Ghetto-bred parents, *Jüdisch* tends to disappear in the melting pot. This fact of itself is evidence of the intrinsically foreign nature of the jargon. Wherever the Jew is brought into close contact with the modern world, it readily gives place to the language of the country.

In Russia, countless stories of Jewish life and manners have been written both in *Jüdisch* and in Russian, and many

of them are of a high literary order. Many have also been written in Hebrew, and on the whole these latter do not possess the artistic merits of the former. But with the death of the author and the passing of his generation, the works in *Jüdisch* and Russian disappear, whereas the Hebrew story, because it is in Hebrew, is still read and reread. Hebrew, amongst the strongest and most sacred possessions of Jewry, has "survival value" for the Jewish people, and because of the Jewish people, and deliberately or through neglect to cast aside a potent factor in our history would be to weaken the solidarity and continuity of our culture. *Jüdisch* on the other hand marks a bitter period in Jewish history. It bears the Ghetto stamp, and for the free development of the Jewish people in the future, *Jüdisch* with its Ghetto associations must be laid aside as an interesting relic of the past.

The Revival of Hebrew as a living language seems to have run parallel with the growth of the Zionist movement. In its connection with the awakening of the national consciousness, the revival was to be no mere literary adventure to exercise the minds of a handful of intellectuals and brilliant scribblers. It was to go hand in hand with the development of Palestine as the future home of the Jewish people. Planted in the historic soil of the nation, the Hebrew sapling, etiolated in the darkness of the European Ghetto, was to grow green and blossom with Jewish fruit. Hebrew was now to become an organ of the nation, a tongue in the true sense of the word.

In the Jewish centres of the Diaspora societies grew up for the development of Hebrew as a living language. But many of these were mushroom growths. They grew in a night, but fell to pieces under the crushing influence of an alien culture and a non-Jewish environment. With the development of the Hebrew communities in Palestine, many of the disturbing influences were eliminated, and the new movement was free to develop its latent capacities. On the historic soil of the Jewish people, the use of Hebrew grew slowly but surely. With a nucleus in the homes of a few enthusiasts, it then became the language of the kindergarten. The kindergarten study of Hebrew by the *Ibrith b'Ibrith*

method had a most interesting influence on the adults. It stimulated the production of Hebrew nursery rhymes which may still be heard in the children's schools throughout the country. The child, the father of the man, taught the Jewish parent the way he should go. Hebrew became the language of the colonics, spreading from one to another, and then the Hebrew Revival spread to the schools and institutes, until the public life of Palestinian Jewry became distinctly coloured by it, with a Hebrew press, Hebrew notices, Hebrew street signs, and Hebrew post-office regulations.

Hebrew is now spoken in the fields and public places of the colonics, and little children may be heard playing and quarrelling in the ancient tongue. The excellent Hebrew secondary schools at Jaffa and at Jerusalem have both adopted Hebrew as the medium of instruction in all subjects, and the original policy of the *Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden*, which has under its guidance many modern institutions, was to further the growth of the Hebrew language in Palestine.

With this growing use of Hebrew in the schools and colleges of Palestine, the burden of demands placed upon the language grew proportionately. A language which had for centuries remained the treasure of the synagogue and the study was naturally lacking in words and expressions of the workaday world. The flexibility which a vernacular demanded was lacking. But the fact that these demands were being made was in itself encouraging to those who were eager to see Hebrew reinstated as the language of a freely developing people. Judaism however, is a jewel of many facets, each facet eager to transmit the light that lies within. The orthodox and the purists raised a storm of opposition against this broadening of the Hebrew language. Hebrew meant for them the hallowed word of the God of Israel written in the Book of Books. He who adds to God's words adds to and violates His Law. But the Hebrew of the Revival was not without champions to defend her cause. Many of the best linguists in the land were engaged in mobilising the words and expressions which were needed, and for this object the "Waad Halashon," or language board, was established. The work was treated

with reverence and discretion, the structure of Hebrew remained untouched. The Biblical writings and the Talmud were found to be mines unquarried, and the various monuments and archæological discoveries were closely examined to yield words which might prove useful. The "Millon," the lexicon of Ben Jehuda, is a monument to the patience and enthusiasm of the pioneers of Hebrew in Palestine. Much, however, will come in the natural course of evolution. The language will itself, by the strain that is placed upon it, adapt itself to the new situation, so that in the course of time the flora and fauna and geological structure of the country, entering into the life of the people, will find answering words in the language. Much can be accomplished in this direction by encouraging nature study in the schools.

Of great value also for the development of Hebrew in Palestine will be the renewal of contact with its sister language, Arabic. The Hebrew revival in the Diaspora is subject to many disabilities, not the least of which is the fact that the languages current in the countries where the number of Jews is considerable (and where, for that reason, a Hebrew revival is possible) are entirely different from Hebrew in vocabulary, syntax, and structure. In spite of themselves, the pioneers of Hebrew literature and speech in Europe are bound to be largely influenced by their familiarity with Aryan tongues. If a new word or expression is needed, it must needs be taken from Russian or Polish or German. And the unconscious borrowings are even more numerous and of greater influence than those which are consciously made. A mind used to Western idioms and forms of speech cannot help importing into Hebrew an alien element, and producing results which are not akin to the true genius of the language. In Palestine, where the main non-Jewish language of the environment is Arabic, the conditions are much more favourable to a truly natural development. Arabic is closely akin to Hebrew; it is a rich language, and it has the advantage of having preserved its contact with life during the centuries in which Hebrew has been divorced from life. It is therefore a language from which Hebrew can be enriched, by borrowings, conscious

and unconscious, without the risk of losing its essential quality. This is true in regard to pronunciation no less than in regard to vocabulary and syntax. The pronunciations of Hebrew which are current among European Jews (especially among Ashkenazim) have obviously been corrupted through the influence of Aryan languages. Though it is by no means certain how Hebrew was pronounced by Isaiah, it may be asserted with safety that Isaiah could not understand his own words as they are read to-day in an Ashkenazi Synagogue. The influence of Arabic, co-operating with the influences of the climate and the natural phenomena of Palestine, may be trusted in time to restore to Hebrew its Eastern character, and to bring it back to the line of development which was broken many centuries ago. Thus Palestine, and Palestine alone, can solve a problem which is the despair of those who demand a genuine, pure Hebrew. The right way to achieve their aim is not that of the so-called "purists," who would forbid the use of any word or form that cannot be found in the Bible (or perhaps in the Bible or the Mishnah). What is needed is that Hebrew should be restored to contact with its native soil and with a living language to which it is closely akin.

Viewing the subject from the wider point of view of Jewish culture in general, we see the most encouraging sign of the progress of the Hebrew Revival in Palestine in the stimulating effect that it has had upon the Jews of the Diaspora. The source of inspiration which earlier societies for the progress of Hebrew lacked is now provided by the fountain head in Palestine. The *Ibrith b'Ibrith* method is scarcely yet a brilliant success, but it is undoubtedly alive, and the high standard of form and substance of the Hebrew reviews and periodicals produced on the Continent leads one to trust confidently in their future development. Thus in miniature we have an example of the influence which a Jewish centre in Palestine can exercise over the minds of the scattered Jewries of the globe. The stronger the centre of Jewish life in Palestine becomes, both materially and spiritually, the deeper and further will its influence be felt.

Although the success of Hebrew culture must depend for its substantiality upon such factors as agriculture, industry, technology, and other material factors of life, it is education, Hebrew education which must supply the form. With the educational system of Palestine built upon Jewish lines, and Hebrew as the language of instruction in school and college, the future stability of Jewish culture in Palestine is assured. To this end Jewish Nationalists have been working untiringly. In spite of the criticism levelled against the *Gymnasium* at Jaffa and its principal, Dr. Mossinsohn, by the more orthodox section of Jewry, the methods of that institution have been Jewish, the language used has been Hebrew. In common with the criticism of the more liberal section of Jewry, the antagonism of the orthodox critics springs partly from a misconception of the aims of Jewish culture, partly from a narrow view that is taken of Judaism.

The narrow and circumscribed attitude of both sections is closely connected with the growing stagnation which is visible at present in the communities of Western Jewry. In all the great cities of Western Europe, and in America, the weakening hold of the synagogue on the minds of young Jewry is becoming more and more manifest. The Jewish youth no longer finds in the modern synagogue an outlet for his mental activities and spiritual aspirations, for from the wider Jewish point of view it does not represent a living Judaism. In the days of the Ghetto proper, the synagogue was truly the centre of Jewish activities ; pressure from without rendered all activities centripetal. But with the disappearance of the Ghetto barriers and the coming of emancipation in certain quarters, centripetal forces gave place to forces centrifugal in their action, with the result that from the Jewish standpoint disintegration has set in. At the same time it must be noted that all the vital activities that do exist in modern Jewry centre around the revival of Palestine and Hebrew culture. It may help to instil into what is rapidly becoming an empty form some of the life it possessed in the past. Judaism both in its Orthodox and Liberal manifestations has failed to keep intact the living connection of Judaism with its past. A

formal connection may have been maintained, but the living tissue which animates these forms has been allowed to decay, or has been deliberately done to death by the introduction of non-Jewish sources of inspiration. From these deadening and disintegrating forces the Hebrew Revival aims at saving Judaism. The Jewish activities in Palestine and the revival of Hebrew promise to give a Jewish meaning to the communities of the West, and a Jewish message to the youth of Jewry. The growing individual can only live a full life, a life of self-expansion and social value, by taking part in the activities of a living community. How then is the young Jew to live the highest and fullest life, if he finds around him no Jewish environment, no Jewish life vital enough to stimulate him to activity? Our temperament, through the countless oscillations of evolution, tends always to accommodate itself more and more to the environment in which we live, to its norm of sociability and morality. Liberal Judaism is sufficiently logical to make the path of the Jewish youth easy enough to enable him to take his place in the society which environs him, and all this at the expense of his Judaism. Liberal Judaism points a smooth path to the non-Jewish world. Orthodoxy, in an heroic endeavour not to unbend, does not allow for the adaptation which nature demands of every organism. Only in the Palestinian Revival will the youth of Jewry be able to expand freely. Their thirst for culture and knowledge will be slaked at the Jewish well in Palestine. Thus the Judaism which the Hebrew Revival is to make possible will be rooted in a developing Hebrew community, its object as wide as life, coloured by Hebrew tradition, a Jewish outlook, and the message of the Prophets and Sages of the past.

The disintegrating tendencies which the Nationalist movement has set itself to defeat have been presented in a very striking form in the recent struggle for the Hebrew language in the schools of Palestine. Although the struggle with the *Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden* is fresh in the memory, it will be apt in this connection to outline the events in the struggle, so as to illustrate the undeniable fact that the Jewish

people of Palestine in particular, and of the world in general, has decided to base its renaissance upon the Hebrew language.

The struggle to hebraise the schools was in part due to a fear of a possible emigration of the colonists from Palestine. The first successes in coping with this danger were obtained in the establishment of the colonies on a nationalist basis with Hebrew as the national language. Jerusalem was the first city to make Hebrew a living language by becoming the nucleus of the future Hebrew press of Palestine. Then followed the High School of Jaffa, and soon Tel Aviv, the first Hebrew urban settlement of the Renaissance, was established. This brings us to the controversy with the *Hilfsverein*. In November of 1908, Paul Nathan, one of its leading members, had said that the work of the *Hilfsverein* was to raise the standard of culture amongst the native population of Palestine, and that in view of the different linguistic origin of these people, Hebrew alone could serve as the necessary language of instruction. The original leaders of the *Hilfsverein* were not blind to the difficulties of such a course, but they went so far as to add "that the problem of making a new language a medium of literary and scientific advancement will be solved in the course of time by means of the same efforts which had led to the revival of the language." But in the course of time, this progressive policy no longer characterised the activities of the *Hilfsverein* in its Palestinian work. It began to show a partiality for German in its schools and institutions. This change of front caused much dissatisfaction and disappointment among those who were zealous for the revival of Hebrew, who could point to the success of the all-Hebrew curriculum of the Jaffa High School. In spite, however, of their growing distrust of the *Hilfsverein*, they continued to help its educational organisation, and some of the foremost Hebraists were among its teachers.

But with the plan for the establishing of a Technical Institute at Haifa the real nature of the difference between the *Hilfsverein* and the Nationalists asserted itself. On the one hand were those who wished to further the development of Hebrew on

Nationalist lines, on the other were ranged those who were working in Palestine for philanthropic ends only.

The establishment of the Haifa *Technicum* was rendered possible by the Wissotski bequest, part of the will of a Jewish merchant in Moscow. Besides the members of the Wissotski family and the *Hilfsverein*, Achad ha'Am and Dr. Shmarya Levin became trustees of the fund. The idea of the fund was expressly to further the Hebrew Renaissance in Palestine, and it was for this very reason that it received the support of the communities of Europe and America, and a number of prominent Americans became members of the Curatorium. Money was granted by the Zionist Organisation to purchase a site, and Dr. Levin had a large share in the initial organisation. He went to Palestine to study the educational requirements of the country, and noted that all the schools that were under nationalist control were examples of a successful endeavour to further the revival of Hebrew, whereas the schools of the *Hilfsverein* were not made instruments for the furtherance of Hebrew culture. He therefore made efforts to wring from the *Hilfsverein* a promise to make Hebrew the language of the Technicum; but he met with little success. After the 11th Zionist Congress, in which the Hebrew Revival in Palestine was discussed, the Curatorium of the new college met in Berlin to arrange the opening of the college. Here matters came to a crisis, Drs. Levin and Tschlenow and Achad ha'Am urged that in view of the success of the Hebrew High Schools of Jaffa and Jerusalem, Hebrew should be made the language of the secondary school which was to be attached to the *Technicum*. But their pleadings fell on deaf ears, and the resolutions which were finally carried practically eliminated Hebrew from the Technical school as a language of instruction. Thus once and for all the *Hilfsverein* broke with its original educational policy and declared open war on the champions of the Hebrew revival.

But within Palestine other tendencies prevailed. Those Jews, whether agriculturalists or teachers or organisers, who stood for the Hebrew Revival, recognised the danger that confronted them if they submitted to the new policy of the

Hilfsverein. Without Hebrew the cultural future of awakening Palestine could scarcely be Hebraic. Encouraged by German material aid and policy, the *Hilfsverein* was (perhaps unconsciously) fostering German methods and inculcating non-Jewish ideals. The protest of the teachers of the Palestinian schools marks an epoch in the History of the Hebrew Revival. All Palestine rose with a unity hitherto unknown in support of the Hebrew cause. The struggle has shown us that Palestine is Hebrew, and that nothing can turn aside the people of Palestine from their national future. The majority of the teachers and pupils of the *Hilfsverein* went over to the ranks of the defenders of Hebrew culture. To cope with the new situation Hebrew schools were established to accommodate the increasing numbers of pupils who wished for Hebrew education. The Teachers' Association (*Merkaz ha-Morim*) appealed to the Zionist Organisation to support this new undertaking, and for the first time in the history of the Jewish National movement Hebrew as the medium of instruction was officially adopted by the Zionist Organisation as an integral part of its educational policy—

“ We welcome ” (so ran the resolution of the Zionist Actions Committee) “ the decision of the Haifa population to found there a Hebrew School and authorise the Inner Actions Committee to contribute an adequate sum.”

The pride of the *Hilfsverein*, the training college for teachers in Jerusalem, lost two of its leading professors in David Yellin and Lipshitz, both of whom threw themselves with ardour into the work of building up the new Hebrew schools. Thus we have in brief a picture of the emancipation of Palestine Jewry from the yoke of those who would bind the developing spirit of the Renaissance. But this internal and moral victory brought with it a victory of a political nature. For not the least important aspect of the struggle for Hebrew is the clear evidence that it affords of the essentially Jewish character of the colonising and cultural work of the nationalist movement. The Zionist organisation showed once for all that it was not

and did not intend to become a tool in the hands of any power with ambitions in Palestine ; that its sole aim was the furtherance of Jewish interests.

In spite of the poverty of the Palestinian communities, money was speedily collected to help the new schools, and the verdict of the Jewries of the world was all in their favour. European and American Jews were wholly against the assimilationist tendencies of the *Hilfsverein* and in favour of the hebraising of the educational system of Palestine. But it is to be hoped that this verdict will be a stimulus to further action. Much must be done outside Palestine to help the work within, and when the world resumes its normal course the promise evoked by the struggle for Hebrew must have its fulfilment. Enthusiastic motions proposed and seconded, platform rhetoric and votes of confidence in our honoured leaders soon evaporate and leave little that is positive behind. If every Jewish child were taught Hebrew as a living language alongside of history and religious education, much would be done to bring the child of the *Galuth* into contact with the child in Palestine. For only by community of feeling and outlook will the scattered Jewries of the world find themselves at one with the future Jewish centre in Palestine. Spread Hebrew education in the Jewish communities of Europe and America, and the seeds blown from Palestine will not fall on barren soil.

The culture of a country has always gathered around its schools and colleges, and therefore the project that has been set afoot to establish a Hebrew University in Jerusalem should provide a nucleus of Hebrew culture both for Palestinian Jewry and for the Jewries of the *Galuth*. It must be borne in mind that in its initial stages the University will have to bear the strain of a polyglot collection of students, and herein will lie the strength of the Hebrew language. In Hebrew will be found a common ground on which the Jews of East and West will be able to meet. Hebrew will make explicit what is implied in the phrase, "All Israel are companions." In this common language they will recognise the oneness of their culture and outlook, the essence of their Jewish brother-

hood. Within the free atmosphere of a Jewish community the natural difficulties arising out of their heterogeneous origin will soon disappear and complete hebraisation will follow of necessity. Apart from its place in the Palestinian Jewish community, and from its value for Jewish students who are denied the possibility of higher education in Europe, the University will serve as a source of the supply of teachers for the Jewries of the rest of the world. Much of the decay of Judaism in the West can be traced to the weakness of Jewish Education. The child is naturally obliged to spend a great part of its time in a secular school, and the little time that is given to Hebrew in the remaining hours is badly filled by teachers who have themselves had little opportunity to drink of the well of Hebrew learning and literature. The University of Jerusalem should supply teachers who have for some time at least lived and studied in a Hebrew atmosphere. Along with the breath of Palestine that they will bring with them, they will also bring a Hebrew that is standardised as regards both pronunciation and vocabulary, for in connection with the University a language academy will be established to protect the developing language from the adventures of faddists and experimenters.

The Bezalel school of Arts and Crafts is also an important element in the Palestinian Hebrew Revival, and some of its light has already been shed upon the Jewish communities of Europe and America. Many Jewish homes possess specimens of the new Palestinian handicrafts, reminding its members that in the home of the Jewish People subtle artificers on whom the spirit has rested are expressing in silver and gold and thread the Jewish genius that moves them. In the woof and the warp of a Bezalel carpet Hebrew characters and emblems enter into and give character to the design. In the woof and the warp of Palestinian Jewry, Hebrew has become the thread of gold which binds the fabric together, and gives character to the whole.

Unhappily the world crisis has checked for the moment all further development in Palestine. But one benefit it may confer upon those in the Diaspora. In the interval during which the possibility of our assisting educational and industrial

work in Palestinian Jewry has declined, we can show what our enthusiasm is worth, whether it has a substantial basis in real conviction, the source of constructive energy, or whether it is a vain thing. Our work for Palestine and in Palestine has been derided as the vapouring of enthusiasts who cannot translate their dreams into the activities of the waking world. But much of the work already performed has owed its origin to the stimulating work of dreamers, writers, and orators.

The task of the Diaspora Jew, therefore, is to further a knowledge of the Hebrew language, to accumulate information and to foster an interest in Palestine. In this connection a special responsibility devolves at the present moment on the Jews of Western Europe and America. The great Jewish centres of Eastern Europe, which have hitherto done most for the national revival, are caught in the grip of the War. The homes of Hebrew learning are being destroyed, perhaps never to recover. Hebrew periodicals and books have almost ceased to appear. It behoves the Jewries of the West to do what in them lies to make good the loss by addressing themselves more seriously to the work of the Hebrew revival, and preparing themselves to take up the national burden when the air is free of the noises of war, and mankind returns to the work of construction. For perhaps in the work of reconstruction the councils of Europe may give us a place in the family of peoples, and if we are found unprepared, the work of our pioneers in Palestine for the Hebrew language and the Jewish people will have been in vain. This is scarcely the hour to paint dream pictures of the future of Palestine, for the outlook is dark while civilisation is passing through its twilight hour. But the new Europe that is to dawn may shed a new light over Zion.

Hebrew Education in Palestine.

AMONG all the manifold branches of work that have to be undertaken by a national movement, there is none more vitally important than the work of education. This is true of a national movement among a people which is already concentrated, to a greater or a less extent, on its own historic soil, but is robbed of the possibility of full national development, or is in danger of losing its identity through the influences of a foreign culture stronger than its own. In such a case, the success of a national movement must depend on the extent to which the younger generation retains its hold on the national ideal; and that in turn must be determined very largely by the extent to which the younger generation is educated in the national spirit, taught to know and to reverence the national past, and accustomed to regard as valuable whatever survives of the national tradition. Education is, then, the very life-breath of a national movement. But of no national movement is this so emphatically true as of Zionism, which is an attempt to restore national life to a people cut off almost entirely from its ancestral land, scattered over the face of the earth, participating in every culture, speaking all languages, assimilated to all types of national life, and thus in constant and ever-growing danger of being split up into fragments, and losing all semblance of national cohesion. The problem of Zionism is much harder than that of other national movements. It has to bring back the people, or some considerable section of it, to the land—a task complicated by all sorts of political and economic difficulties; and at the same time it has to secure that the heterogeneous body of human beings so brought together shall be fused and moulded into a recognisable national group. The first of these objects is to be achieved by organisation, political effort, and practical colonising work in Palestine; the second demands above all things a national system of education for those who are to live in Palestine, since it is primarily through education that the fusion of the diverse elements into a

national whole must be brought about. It is idle to argue as to the relative importance of the two kinds of work. Both are essential. But, if it is true that the aim of Zionism cannot be achieved without the concentration of a large number of Jews in Palestine, it is equally true that Zionism cannot fulfil its function as a national movement without national education in Palestine.

But what, it may be asked, is a national education? An answer is obviously impossible, if what is expected is a precise statement of the methods that a national education ought to adopt, and the subjects that it ought to include. A national education is defined rather by its aims and its results than by its methods or content: it is an education which aims at producing, and does produce, in a given group of human beings, the sense of being a nation, of being bound together, and distinguished from other groups, by a common national tradition and a common national hope. But two requirements may be postulated as essential. In the first place, a national education must be carried on in the national language: for that group-sense which is necessary to the being of a nation is intimately bound up with the tie of a common and distinctive idiom. And in the second place, a national education must insist on maintaining and emphasising the sense of continuity with the national past. A new nation may be formed in course of time through the fusion of a number of heterogeneous human beings who happen to be congregated in a given piece of territory. But if what is desired is not a new nation, but the continuance of one already in existence, then the link with the past is all-important; and while in the case of an established nation that link may be maintained by the persistence of beliefs, customs, and habits of thought and action, which are handed down unconsciously from one generation to the next, in the case of a nation struggling for new life, and uncertain of its hold on its past, the school has an important part to play in familiarising and vivifying the distinctive elements of the national tradition to the minds of the growing generation.

Thus, while the precise form and scope of the national education that we need in Palestine cannot be mapped out in advance, it is at least essential that the education should be in Hebrew, which is our national language, and that it should pay considerable attention to the history of our own people, to the

characteristic ideas and ways of thought with which our national life has been associated in the past, and to the literature in which those ideas and ways of thought are embodied. It is important to remember that the battle is not ended when Hebrew has been established as the language of the school and the university. It is possible to conceive a national group educated in the Hebrew language, and yet educated in a spirit quite different from, and even hostile to, that of our national past, and so becoming in effect a new nation, attached by no real tie of historical continuity to the Hebrew nation of days gone by, or to the Jewish people of to-day. This danger is sometimes exaggerated by anti-Zionists, who regard the revival of the real Hebrew nation as a bad thing, and are therefore very ready to seize on and denounce any development which seems likely to lead to the creation of a Hebrew-speaking but un-Hebraic national group—since it is convenient for them to mask their antagonism to the real revival under a righteous opposition to the sham. We need not take too seriously their suggestion that the life and education of Jews in Palestine cannot claim to be Jewish unless they reproduce in every detail the mass of rite and custom and belief which has attached itself to Judaism in the long centuries of exile. We must be prepared for development in Palestine, and for far-reaching development. But we shall do well to remember that the maintenance of historical continuity is far more important for Zionists, who want the Hebrew nation to live, than for anti-Zionists, who do not, and that continuity cannot be secured by language alone. The problem of working out an education which shall satisfy the demands of past and present alike is one of the most difficult of those that confront us in Palestine; but it can be solved if it is approached in the right spirit. And the insistence on Hebrew is a necessary condition, if it is not a guarantee, of a really national system of education.

The problem as it presents itself to us to-day did not exist for the philanthropic organisations of Western Jews which first took in hand the provision of educational facilities for the Jews of Palestine. They had no vision of a restored Jewish national life; they scarcely even recognised in Palestine a country having special claims on Jewish effort. The problem of the Jews in Palestine was for them but a part of the general problem of the Jews in the East, who were sunk in poverty, ignorance

and superstition, and needed to be uplifted by education of the western pattern. Thus the task which these organisations set themselves was entirely different from that of Zionism, and their work in Palestine has no direct bearing on the creation of a system of national education in our sense of the word. None the less, their work is by no means without importance from the Zionist point of view. If not for them, the conditions with which Zionism had to cope when it commenced its work in Palestine would have been far different, both for good and for evil, from what they actually were. Some account of the work of these organisations is therefore necessary in a survey of Hebrew education in Palestine.

The earliest and biggest of them was the *Alliance Israélite Universelle*, founded in Paris in 1860. The *Alliance* aimed at being an international organisation for the protection of Jewish interests throughout the world, but in practice it remained predominantly French, and its sphere of work was restricted to the Orient and Eastern Europe. As early as 1870 the *Alliance* founded an Agricultural School—*Mikveh Israel*—near Jaffa. This step was due to the influence of a Rabbi of Posen, Hirsh Kaliseher, who in 1862 advocated the agricultural colonisation of Palestine by Jews; and the school might have done much to further that end if not for the French spirit which permeated its teaching, and led its pupils to prefer emigration from Palestine to remaining in the land. Some years later, when there was a considerable influx of East-European Jews into Palestine, the *Alliance* considerably extended its educational work in the country. Between 1881 and 1906 it founded over a dozen schools in the principal towns—Jerusalem, Jaffa, Haifa, Safed, and Tiberias. Besides ordinary boys' and girls' schools, the *Alliance* has special schools for training in handicrafts. Generally speaking, the tendency of its schools is to give a French education with a slight Jewish colouring. The language of instruction is French; the teachers are for the most part imbued with French culture, and have no interest in Palestine for its own sake; and the result is that the ideal of the pupils is generally to get to Paris. Thus, while the *Alliance* has done excellent educational work, in the sense that it has provided an education and the possibility of making their way in the world for thousands of children who without it would have remained ignorant and economically useless, yet from the point of view

of national Jewish education its alien spirit and ideals make it a danger. It should be added, however, that not all the Palestinian Schools of the *Alliance* are of quite the same type. A good deal of freedom is left to the teachers, and, where they are to some extent in sympathy with the national movement, the schools are less aggressively French. The *Mikveh Israel* School is a case in point. The recent appointment of a new headmaster, whose leaning is towards Hebrew, has transformed the spirit of the school, and it may yet become a valuable asset of the national revival.

The contribution of English Jews to Palestinian education is the Evelina de Rothschild School, which was founded in 1880, and was taken over by the Anglo-Jewish Association in 1898. Naturally, the language of instruction was English; but the school reflected English and Anglo-Jewish characteristics in two ways which gave its development a different turn from that taken by the schools of the *Alliance*. It was more inclined to lay stress on the Jewish religion; and it was more open in practice to the influence of ideas to which its supporters were opposed in theory. Hence the school was able not only to maintain a Jewish spirit, but even to admit Hebrew as a language of instruction for something like one-half of its curriculum. In practice its pupils are much more at home in Hebrew than in English; and while the school is not likely ever to become avowedly Hebrew, it may be expected that it will be more and more influenced by the Hebrew revival, and will never be a stumbling-block in the way of national education.

The *Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden*, the great German-Jewish organisation which does educational work in Palestine, has moved in a direction precisely opposite to that taken by the Anglo-Jewish Association. The *Hilfsverein*, founded in 1900, at a time when the Hebrew revival was already well established, appeared to be very amenable to the new influence, and its schools were practically Hebrew schools from the start, despite the absence of any avowed nationalist sympathies. The *Hilfsverein* lays special stress on Kindergartens, of which it has three in Jerusalem, three in Jaffa, and one each in Haifa, Safed, and Tiberias. It has also a Teachers' Seminary and a Commercial School in Jerusalem, as well as Boys' and Girls' Schools. Thus this organisation promised to be a valuable asset to the cause of national education. But three or four

years ago a change came over its policy, and a tendency set in to introduce German as the language of instruction. The result of this change was the "language struggle" which followed the disagreement between the Zionist organisation and the *Hilfsverein* over the proposed Technical School at Haifa.* This struggle has produced a breach between the two organisations which is possibly irreparable; but it has had also the effect of stimulating the cause of Hebrew education in Palestine, through the opening of a number of new Hebrew Schools in the towns.

The three bodies mentioned above, English, French, and German, have all worked to provide a modern education for Jewish children in the Palestinian towns; but each has worked along lines conditioned not so much by any specifically Jewish aims, as by the outlook which its leaders derived from being themselves assimilated to the culture of this or that European country. Their activities helped to determine the conditions with which Zionists had to deal when they in turn came face to face with the problem of education in Palestine. On the one hand, they had familiarised certain sections of the Jewish population with the methods and subjects of western education. They had established schools of a modern type, a type hitherto unknown to Palestinian Jews, who but for their efforts might have remained content to leave their children either without education or with no education other than that of the *cheder*. Also, they had introduced education for girls, thereby making good a very serious deficiency in the traditional Jewish system, which generally regards *Torah* as an exclusively male privilege. But on the other hand, they had set up a false conception of the object to which Jewish education in Palestine should be directed, inasmuch as they had associated the idea of modern education with the idea of English, French, or German education. Thus from the Zionist point of view, which demands a system of education that shall be modern in method and extent, but at the same time true to the national spirit, and free from any tendency to assimilate the pupils to other nations than their own, the work of these organisations was in some ways helpful, but in others harmful. This, however, applies only to the towns. In the agricultural colonies, which sprang up as a direct result of nationalist strivings, the Zionist idea had freer

*See Pamphlet No. 7—"Palestine and the Hebrew Revival"—p. 11.

scope in the field of education. The schools in the colonies were not provided by philanthropists for Jewish children who would otherwise have had no education (at least in the modern sense), but came into existence with the colonies themselves, and therefore they express, with more or less completeness, the spirit which animates the colonisation movement.

There are about thirty Jewish agricultural Colonies in Palestine (excluding farms and small settlements), and each of them has its school, where the children of the colonists receive an elementary education. The language of instruction in all these schools is Hebrew. That seems a simple and natural fact, but it is in reality the result of a great deal of idealism and hard work. For the mother-tongue of most of the colonists was Yiddish, and the line of least resistance for them would have been to bring up their children also in Yiddish. But the idea of the return to the national language was closely bound up with that of the return to the national land, and the teachers, who were enthusiasts for Hebrew, found no opposition on the part of the parents to their determination to make the schools of the colonies Hebrew schools. The difficulties with which they had to contend arose rather from the fact that Hebrew had been so long out of use as a medium of every-day intercourse, and was not even their own mother-tongue, nor the language of the homes from which their pupils came. It speaks much for the enthusiasm and the ability of the early teachers that they overcame these difficulties, and established Hebrew firmly as the language of the schools. It is thanks to their work that, though the older settlers still retain their Yiddish, Hebrew is the natural language of the younger generation of Palestinian Jews on the land, and that, so far as language can secure it, the attachment of the colonists' children to their people and their land is secured.

The education given in the colony schools comprises the usual elementary school subjects, as well as Arabic, some knowledge of which is necessary for the Palestinian Jew. The Bible and Jewish history are, of course, taught. In some of the colony schools the pupils are taught French. This is explained by the fact that many of the colonies were for some time (and some still are) under the control of the Jewish Colonisation Association, which is a French body. Even in those colonies which are now wholly independent the school is subventioned,

through the Jewish Colonisation Association, by Baron Edmond de Rothschild, to whom the new Jewish settlement in Palestine owes so much. But the subvention carries with it no interference in the internal management of the schools, which is left entirely to the colonists.

The colony schools have been spoken of as a whole, but it is not to be imagined that they were originally planned on a single model, or according to the views of a single central authority. They have grown up independently of one another, and therefore differ in character according to differences of local circumstances. But of recent years some degree of co-ordination and conformity to a single standard has been introduced through the work of the *Merkaz ha-Morim*—the Palestinian “National Teachers’ Union,” which appoints teachers for the colony schools, and furthers educational development by the issue of a Hebrew pedagogical journal (*Ha-Chinnuch*) and by other means. When this process of standardisation has been carried somewhat further (assuming that present conditions continue to obtain after the war), the colony schools will form in their totality a national elementary school system—though on a minute scale—with the Baron’s subvention taking the place of State aid, and the *Merkaz ha-Morim* performing some of the functions of a Board of Education.

The colony schools are sometimes criticised—in common with the whole of Zionist work in Palestine—on the ground that they are not “religious” in character. This criticism is largely based on a misunderstanding which is not unnatural in western Jews. The conditions under which Jews live in western countries cause them to regard “Jewish” and “religious” as convertible terms when applied to their own lives. Reading, writing, arithmetic, languages, and so forth are for them “secular” or “non-Jewish” subjects: they are studied by Jews in company with non-Jews, and in the language of the country, and are therefore not specifically Jewish. Such Jewish education as their children receive is given by a special teacher, or in the “religion class,” and is concerned (at all events in theory) solely with “religious” matters. It is analogous to the teaching which the Christian children are given in the Sunday schools. For people accustomed to this state of things it is very difficult to imagine an educational system in which there is no distinction between “Jewish” and

“ non-Jewish,” and in which the day-school performs the functions both of the “ secular ” school and of the “ religion class.” There is obviously no need for special classes to teach the child of a Palestinian colonist Hebrew, which is his natural language, and the language in which he receives all his instruction ; nor is there need for special classes to teach him about the feasts and fasts of the Jewish calendar, or the ceremonial observances, because these are part of the texture of his life, and he becomes familiar with their historical origin through learning the history of his people as an ordinary school subject. The character of Jewish life, and the facts of Jewish history, are such that a Hebrew school in a Hebrew-speaking colony cannot be “ secular ” in the sense of shutting out everything which western Jews call “ religious ” ; and if this fact is remembered, much of the criticism of the colony schools is at once discounted. But it is true, generally speaking, that the schools do not aim at cultivating a “ religious spirit,” or at enforcing ceremonial observance. Nor is it part of their real function to do so, since the attitude of the individual in matters of that kind must be determined by temperament and the custom of the home, rather than by the teaching of the school. This does not mean that the colony schools have necessarily attained the ideal attitude on the problem of religious education. There is room for experiments of different kinds, like the “ Talmud Torahs ” founded in the colony of Petach-Tikvah and elsewhere by a German Jewish organisation, which aim at giving a more “ orthodox ” bent to the children’s minds than they are thought likely to acquire in the ordinary colony school. But ultimately the ideals of a school, in this as in other matters, must reflect the wishes of those for whose benefit the school exists, and cannot be strait-waistcoated by theorists at a distance.

Schools of the elementary type are the only schools in the agricultural colonies, none of which is as yet large enough to need a Grammar School of its own. But the growth of the colonisation movement naturally produced a demand for secondary education, and led to the foundation of secondary schools in the towns, where the needs of elementary education had already been met to some extent by the philanthropic organisations. Not that Zionist effort in the field of elementary education has been entirely confined to the colonies. The Hebrew Girls’ School in Jaffa, founded some years ago by the

Chovevé Zion of Odessa, is entirely a creation of the new spirit, which demands that Jewish education in Palestine shall be national; and the recent difference with the *Hilfsverein* led to the secession from the schools of that body of a number of nationally-minded teachers, who founded Hebrew schools in Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Haifa. But it remains true that elementary education in the towns is mostly in the hands of the philanthropic organisations. In secondary education, on the other hand, the Zionist movement has led the way, and it is in this field that it has produced its most considerable educational achievement—the Hebrew Secondary School of Tel-Aviv (the Hebrew suburb of Jaffa). For the Jaffa *Gymnasium*, as it is called, though not directly founded by the Zionist organisation, is a product of the Zionist spirit, and its building stands on land of the Jewish National Fund.

The Jaffa *Gymnasium* was founded in 1907, to meet the demand for a more advanced education than could be obtained in the Hebrew schools then existing in Palestine. The resources of the Committee which started it were small, but they were fortunate in securing the sympathy and assistance of Alderman Moser, of Bradford, who provided a handsome and capacious building, and has liberally supported the school for many years. Financial difficulties were not the most serious with which the promoters of the school had to contend. They set out to give a modern higher education in a language which had never been used for that purpose. They had to create the terminology required for teaching scientific subjects, and the teachers themselves had to learn before they could teach. Moreover, the *Gymnasium* attracted pupils from Russia, who were not familiar with Hebrew as a spoken idiom, and this added to the difficulty of making Hebrew the sole medium of instruction. But what seemed impossible was achieved. To-day the curriculum of the *Gymnasium* embraces, in the higher classes, mathematics, physics, chemistry and Latin, besides European languages, Turkish and Arabic. A number of Universities in Europe have accepted its leaving certificate as equivalent to that of a European Secondary School. The experiment has thus been amply justified from a general educational standpoint. And the popularity of the *Gymnasium* is proved by the fact that the number of its pupils, which was under 100 in 1907, had risen to 700 before the war—this in

spite of the fact that a certain amount of hostility has been aroused by the alleged non-religious or anti-religious character of the school. What has been said above on this subject in regard to the colony schools is true also of the *Gymnasium*; but the *Gymnasium* has had to face severer criticism, both because it is more in the public eye, and because the scope of its education is wider, and therefore gives more points for attack. In particular, the use of the methods of "higher criticism" in Bible teaching has been fastened on as indicating an anti-Jewish tendency. This question is a thorny one, and its discussion is not rendered easier by the fact that critics of the school are wont to talk as though "higher criticism" were doled out to the pupils in the lowest classes; while in the heat of attack and defence there is a tendency to overlook the important fact that the *Gymnasium* does make an honest attempt to bring home to its pupils both the spiritual value and the beauty of the Bible, and is in that sense working on truly national lines. Nor is any lack of reverence for Jewish tradition evident among the pupils, who study Talmud with as much zest as could be expected in any *Yeshibah*. The war has sent many of them temporarily back to Europe, and those who meet these products of the *Gymnasium* education will find in them no evidence of the undermining tendencies of which the school is accused in certain quarters. It is necessary in dealing with the *Gymnasium* to distinguish between criticism of detail, which may be well founded, and general accusations of un-Jewishness, which emanate from those who are hostile to the national revival. Judged from the standpoint of the revival, the *Gymnasium* is a contribution of high value to the work of Jewish national education.

There is a second *Gymnasium*, in Jerusalem, which is smaller than that at Jaffa, and somewhat more orthodox in tendency. There is also at Jaffa a higher-grade school, called *Tachkemoni*, which was founded by the orthodox wing of Zionists (the Mizrachi). Beyond these three schools secondary education in Palestine has not gone. The proposed Technical School at Haifa is in abeyance, thanks to the volte-face of the *Hilfsverein* on the language question; and the Hebrew University is as yet but a project, to be realised, one may hope, soon after the return to normal conditions.

In the *Bezalel* School of Arts and Crafts, at Jerusalem, the

national movement has attacked the problem of education on the artistic side. The attempt to create a specifically Jewish art is fraught with many difficulties. Broadly speaking, Jewish artists are not Jewish except by birth: their subjects and methods of treatment are borrowed. The Jewish tradition of the last few centuries is almost wholly devoid of any interest in art. It cannot yet be said whether the carpets and wood-work and filigree-work of the *Bezalel* will stand out as creations at once artistically valuable and specifically Jewish in character. But at least the work of the *Bezalel* has already done much to stimulate the national feeling among Jews in many parts of the world. The same is true, in a lesser degree, of the lace-work schools of the Union of Jewish Women for Cultural Work in Palestine. They are symptomatic of the craving of the national spirit to express itself in all possible ways.

The work of national education in Palestine, like the colonisation movement of which it is an integral part, is still at an early stage of development. What it has achieved so far is to establish Hebrew as the language of the schools, and to indicate the lines on which the various problems can be solved. And that is much. If immigration proceeds at a more rapid rate after the war, and new schools have to be provided quickly to meet the new needs, they will have the existing Hebrew schools as a model to follow. There will be no hesitation as to the possibility of giving a complete education in Hebrew, and no lack of teachers qualified in that language; there will be no foundation for the suggestions, which will no doubt be heard in Europe, that modern schools in Palestine must be English or French or German schools, that Hebrew is a dead language, that Hebrew cannot find words for scientific terms, and so forth. The experiments already made are sufficient to dispose of those suggestions. As the Jewish settlement in Palestine grows, whether quickly or slowly, the network of Hebrew national Schools will grow with it, to perform its function of moulding the children of immigrants from East and West into the nucleus of a healthy Hebrew nation.

Jewish Colonisation and Enterprise in Palestine.

THE Jewish colonies in Palestine are the visible and practical result of the ideals and aims of Zionism.

They are at once a test of the practicability of the Zionist ideal, and an irrefutable argument against those who maintain that Palestine is impossible as a field for Jewish colonisation. They are also a proof that there exist no obstacles and difficulties which Jews cannot overcome in the effort to win for themselves a footing in their ancestral land. The colonies may truly be said to form the nucleus of a real national existence.

The history of Jewish colonisation in Palestine falls into four distinct periods:—

1. 1870-1883 : The era of voluntary organisations and individual effort.
2. 1883-1899 : The Rothschild period.
3. 1899-1907 : The J.C.A.⁽¹⁾ period.
4. From 1907 onwards : The period of Zionist activity.

It will be seen at a glance that these periods correspond with the development of colonisation in Palestine from sporadic individual and philanthropic efforts to a partially organised world-wide movement.

The modern movement for the return to Palestine dates from about the year 1860, when there began a propaganda amongst the orthodox Jews of Russia which aimed at the establishment of Jewish agricultural settlements or colonies in Palestine. After a lapse of 2,000 years, Jews were to return to their land, not simply to end their days there, and to wail at the last remaining fragment of the Temple walls, as was the custom among the ultra-orthodox, but to repeople the ancient land with a living nation; to be pioneers in the renaissance of a people, and to lay the foundations of a new Israel. Inspired by enthusiasm for their past, they were to

(1) J.C.A. is an abbreviation currently used to denote the Jewish Colonisation Association, which was founded in 1893, by Baron Hirsch, for the purpose of establishing and developing Jewish Colonies in North and South America or elsewhere.

live once more in the land of their ancestors, to carve out their own destinies untrammelled by the influences of a foreign environment. This idea, though at first rather theoretical than practical, could not long remain barren. It bore its first fruit ten years later, in 1870, when the newly founded *Alliance Israélite Universelle* established an agricultural school called *Mikveh Israel*, on a site about ten miles from Jaffa on the road to Jerusalem. The land, about 600 acres, on which this school was built, was presented to the *Alliance* by the Turkish Government, which at that period did not look with disfavour on an attempt to develop an outlying and long neglected province of the Ottoman Empire. In this farm-school of *Mikveh Israel* were placed Russian Jewish students, who studied the agricultural problems of Palestine, from the theoretical and practical standpoints, and later founded new colonies, or became successful farmers in established colonies.

The next important step in the history of the Jewish colonies was the purchase by some Palestinian Jews of a strip of land alongside the river Audja, on which they founded the now highly prosperous colony of Petach-Tikvah. This enterprise, which dates from 1878, is at once the first successful attempt at Jewish agricultural colonisation in Palestine, and the only one which had its origin in the country itself. The source of all subsequent colonising effort was in the Jewries of Russia, Galicia, and Roumania; and the colonising movement received its first great impetus from the violent anti-semitic outbreaks of the early eighties of the last century, and the consequent persecutions of the Jews. The idea of the return to Palestine appealed strongly to the imagination both of the masses and of the intellectual classes among the Jews of Eastern Europe. Many societies of *Chovevé Zion* ("Lovers of Zion") were formed with the object of encouraging and supporting Jewish colonisation in Palestine. In particular, students formed themselves into groups with the object of going out to Palestine and founding agricultural settlements. They were to be the pioneers of the national rebirth. In their inexperience and enthusiasm these men overlooked the difficulties of colonising on unprepared and practically virgin soil. They had no definite plan, they were without means or experience, and, more important still, without knowledge of the country and its inhabitants; but they were inspired by a glorious vision.

Of this type were the men who in 1882 founded the colony of Rishon-le-Zion, a few miles S.S.E. of Jaffa—the creation of students who forsook their books, and left the land of their birth, to work as pioneers in the colonisation of that land which was the outward sign of what remained to them of the glorious traditions of their past. Other students' societies founded the colonies of Rosh-Pinah in Galilee, and Zichron-Jakob in Samaria. In the same year also, a Russian Jew purchased a large tract of land in the Wadi-el-Chanin district, the greater portion of which has since been resold to the ever-increasing Russian Jewish settlers. A year later (1883) there was founded the colony of Jessod-Hamaalah, and in 1884 Mishmar-Hajarden, both in Galilee. When we remember that the original settlers had practically no knowledge of agriculture, and no means whatever of organising the development of the country, they seem to have accomplished a task almost superhuman. An impartial observer would certainly have prophesied speedy failure for colonies established under such conditions; and indeed it was not long before the plight of the colonies became desperate. The resources of the settlers were exhausted, and their supporters in Russia, the *Chovevé Zion*, had not the means to help them adequately. But at the critical moment help was forthcoming from another quarter. The struggling colonies aroused the interest of Baron Edmond de Rothschild, an interest which soon developed into enthusiasm. Baron Edmond took under his protection those colonies which were languishing for want of proper support, and played a great part in their future development. These colonies were four, Rishon-le-Zion, Zichron-Jakob, Rosh-Pinah, and Petach-Tikvah. In 1884 Baron Edmond founded the colony of Ekron, a short distance from Wadi-el-Chanin. In the same year those members of the *Bilu*⁽¹⁾ Societies who had immigrated into Palestine in 1882 and 1883 founded the colony of Katra, south of Wadi-el-Chanin. These students had fitted themselves for their work at the farm-school of *Mikveh Israel*. The year 1888 saw the colony of Zichron-Jakob extended by the purchase of a large tract of land, on which were founded the two small colonies of Shefeja and Bath Shlomo.

In 1887 and 1892 there were founded the colonies of Kastinieh in the south and Kafr-Saba, near Petach-Tikvah,

(1) The Jewish Students' Societies, so called from the initials of the Hebrew words which they took as their motto (meaning "Come, let us go to the house of Jacob").

in the north of Judæa. Baron Rothschild's purchases also included large tracts of land in lower Galilee, where the J.C.A. colonies were later established, and a very large piece of territory east of the Jordan (now close to the Hedjaz railway). This is a territory of about 30,000 acres, but it has not yet been opened out, chiefly because of the feeling of insecurity occasioned by the presence of turbulent Bedouin Arabs. Other colonies established in Judæa during this period are Reehoboth, founded in 1890 by a private colonisation society of Warsaw; Chederah, founded in 1891 near the old town of Caesarea; the small colony of Moza, built by some Jews of Jerusalem, and situated about three miles from that city; and Djemama, founded in 1895 by the Odessa Committee⁽¹⁾ on the southernmost frontier of Palestine, near Gaza. On the northernmost frontier, at the foot of Mount Hermon, was founded the colony of Metula, on a site bought by Baron Rothschild in 1895. In the same year a Bulgarian Jewish Colonisation Company founded the colony of Artuf, on the main railway line between Jaffa and Jerusalem, and in 1899 were founded the two small colonies of Maehanayim and Ain Zeitun, both near Rosh-Pinah.

The year 1899 may be said to close a definite period in the history of Jewish Colonisation in Palestine, for in this year the J.C.A. took over those colonies which had been founded or were maintained by Baron Rothschild, *i.e.*, Rishon-le-Zion, Ekron, Petach-Tikvah, Zichron-Jakob, Rosh-Pinah, Jessod-Hamaalah, Metula and Atlit.

The events leading up to this transference of the Rothschild colonies to the J.C.A. demonstrated clearly that it was impossible to expect a sound, healthy development of the Jewish colonies so long as they were managed on philanthropic lines. Colonisation could only progress if the settlers had that stimulus which springs from a desire for independence and a determination to be self-supporting. The first enthusiasm of the original settlers had been somewhat tempered by the continual and unequal struggle for existence, and when the generous aid of Baron Rothschild was offered to them, the colonists not unnaturally began to take advantage of his munificence. On the other hand, it must be said for the colonists that when Baron Rothschild took over the colonies,

(1) That is to say the *Choveve Zion*, whose centre was from the outset of Odessa. Though the *Choveve Zion* have largely become merged in the Zionist movement, the Odessa Committee still carries on extensive work in the interests of Palestinian Colonisation, which it assists in many ways, but more especially on the educational side. The Committee works in co-operation with the Zionist Organisation.

their development was made to depend to too large an extent on the administration which he formed to look after his interests in Palestine, and thus initiative and self-help were discouraged.

This will become evident if we take a brief survey of the period of Rothschild government as a whole.

When it came to the knowledge of Baron Rothschild that the Jewish Colonies in Palestine were in low water, and needed help from outside, he sent out experts, who presented him with reports on the condition of the colonies. On receipt of these expert reports he decided to take over the four colonies which were in the most embarrassed situation, viz., Rishon-le-Zion, Zichron-Jakob, Rosh-Pinah and Petach-Tikvah. His idea was to introduce into Palestine intensive cultivation of the vine, based on the French system, in order to get the maximum yield on the minimum of cultivated land. As many years must pass before a profitable return from the vineyards could be obtained, it was necessary to do one of two things : either (*a*) to maintain the colonists during this period, or (*b*) to put them to work in the vineyards at a maximum wage. Both these plans were adopted by the Rothschild administration, with the result that an artificial state of well-being was created. To make matters worse, the administration, in order to bolster up the vine-growers, fixed a minimum price for the wine output. Large and magnificent wine-cellars were built to stock the wine, and as, owing to the lack of business qualities, the administration failed to grasp the first principles of commerce, the sale of the wine output was very small. The idea of the administration was that the wine would be bought by the orthodox Jews for use in connection with various ceremonies enjoined by the Jewish ritual. Hence the large stocks which remained on hand after the ordinary demand had been met were shipped to London, and sold by auction for what they would fetch. It did not occur to the administration that a market could be created for the wine amongst non-Jews. As a result, millions of francs were sacrificed under this regime. Added to this was the extravagance of the administration ; for example, magnificent parks were laid out, kitchen-gardens of an expensive kind encouraged, and winecellars built on a larger and finer scale than anywhere even in Europe. In a word, it was an attempt to build from the top, instead of from the bottom, and such an edifice could not stand. It was

naturally impossible to continue this system for any length of time. The end was hastened by over-production, for when the other colonies saw the apparent success of the four original Rothschild colonies, they hastened to introduce wine cultivation, often on land which would have yielded better returns if planted with other produce. In the result, these colonies (Wadi-el-Chanin, Katra, and the newer colonies of Rechoboth and Chederah), as well as the original wine-growing colonies, soon found that their prosperity rested on a very insecure basis. By reason of the overstocking of the market, due to over-production, artificially stimulated by the minimum price arrangement, a time arrived when it was impossible to maintain the minimum price. It was useless for the administration to attempt to cover the ever-increasing annual deficit. It was then found that under normal conditions the yield per acre of land was not in reality even sufficient to enable those colonists who had hitherto depended for their livelihood on winegrowing to obtain the bare necessities of life. It was evident that the colonies were developing on a false economic basis, and that the result could never be true prosperity, and in the nature of things this was bound to react not only on the material, but also on the moral prospects of the colonists. The settlers, particularly in the colonies under the Rothschild administration, lost their independence of character and initiative, and there ensued a period of economic stagnation. Philanthropy, though it springs from the best intentions, is poor food for a growing nation, and it soon ceases to nourish.

One thing, however, must be remembered in extenuation of the Rothsechild administration, namely, that these early Jewish settlers were for the most part Jews from Russia and Roumania, who, though inspired by a great enthusiasm and a noble ideal, had never been accustomed to discipline, and had neither experience of agriculture nor great physical endurance. They thus easily allowed themselves to be led away from the strict path of economic independence, and readily acquiesced in the generosity of the Rothsechild administration as a means of bridging over the first few years of non-productivity. Again, whatever the faults of the Rothsechild administration may have been, nothing but praise is due to the man who seized the opportunity, at a period when it was of the utmost urgency, to come to the support of the struggling Jewish colonies. Not only the Jewish colonists of Palestine, but the Jews of the

whole world, owe to Baron Rothschild a debt which can never be repaid. It is due to his personal enthusiasm and munificence that the colonies were able to survive their early difficulties and to attain to their present state of development.

When the evils of the system adopted by his administration in Palestine came to the knowledge of Baron Rothschild, he decided to transfer the administration of the colonies to the hands of the J.C.A.—an organisation which had already obtained a great deal of experience in Jewish colonisation in other parts of the world. The J.C.A. in taking over the colonies had to face the difficult task of making a clean sweep of the evils resulting from the philanthropic system, and establishing the colonies on a sound economic basis. Its plan was to help the colonies in such a way that they would gradually acquire economic independence, become entirely self-supporting, and reach a state in which they could manage their own internal affairs, without outside assistance or interference. The following is an extract from the report of the J.C.A. for 1900 on the transference of the Jewish colonies in Palestine into its hands:—

The colonies supported by Baron Rothschild have passed under our administration from the 1st January, 1900. . . . Profound administrative changes have seemed necessary. The plan of reform drawn up by us may be briefly summarised as follows:—

1. Simplification of the administration by a reduction of its personnel ;
2. Reduction or suppression where necessary of all expenditure not of a strictly productive character. Handing over to the colonists of communal services ;
3. Reduction of expenditure on cultivation and of the cost of production generally ;
4. Development of the sale of the produce ;
5. Introduction and extension of remunerative cultivation ;
6. Further acquisition of land of good productivity.

This in brief was the new method of administration to be applied to the Jewish Colonies by the J.C.A., so that they might be put into some regular and ordered economic system. To the credit of the J.C.A. it must be said that it has contributed very materially to the economic and social progress of the colonies.

After the collapse of the minimum price system, an intolerable situation arose amongst the vine cultivators, and in order to put an end to this, a syndicate was formed of 352 planters, called “The Co-operative Society of Vine-Cultivators of the Great Cellars of Rishon-le-Zion and Ziebron-Jakob.” The capital granted by the J.C.A. to this syndicate was

£66,000, and it took over all the vineyards, stocks of wine, cellars, and claims of the planters. Its first piece of work was to reduce the wine output, and to put it more into harmony with its selling capacity; in other words, to put the wine industry on a more business-like basis. In Rishon-le-Zion 150 hectares of vineyards were uprooted, for which the planters received £3,680. With this money were planted, in place of the vine, almonds, oranges, olives, and various other kinds of fruit trees, for which there was already an assured market. The J.C.A. also bought neighbouring lands suitable for agriculture, for it saw clearly that a colony could not depend entirely on vine cultivation, and that the system of monoculture, if persisted in, must inevitably lead to further crises. Thus between 1904 and 1908 the J.C.A. lent to the colonists of Rishon-le-Zion sums of £1,200 and £600 to enable them to purchase the neighbouring Arab village of Sarfend and to develop agriculture there. In 1910 the J.C.A. extended the colony by a further purchase of approximately 600 acres, and on this occasion also lent £600 to the colonists. It must be noted that the money was not given by the J.C.A., but lent. It was not a piece of philanthropy, but an ordinary business transaction; interest had to be paid on the loan, and the principal had to be redeemed within a certain fixed period. Land near the neighbouring Arab village of Bededjen, amounting to approximately 771 acres, was also purchased and used for agricultural purposes. It was also under the guidance of the J.C.A. that, besides the planting of orange groves, olive trees, etc., afforestation was begun on a small scale. In Bededjen in 1909 lupine trees were planted in order to revivify the land, which was worked out. The following table shows clearly the change in the plantations in Rishon-le-Zion between 1900 and 1911 :—

APPROXIMATE VALUE OF PRODUCE (in Pounds Sterling)

	Vineyards	Almonds	Olives	Tomatoes	Oranges	Corn	Total
1900 :	11,420	140	20	85	£11,665
1911 :	6,020	800	1,200	800	£8,820

Thus purchases of suitable agricultural land gave a valuable “second string” to colonies which had hitherto depended solely on vine-cultivation, and as a result they were able to develop on sound lines.

The task which the J.C.A. has set itself to perform has been brilliantly carried out, especially in view of the difficult

conditions which existed at the time when the colonies were taken over. The value of the J.C.A.'s experience was that it knew that no hard and fast rules could be laid down for all the colonies, but that each colony must be taken separately and treated in accordance with conditions peculiar to itself. Thus the treatment of Rishon-le-Zion contrasts with that of Jessod Hamaalah, in Upper Galilee.. This colony had also been under the Rothschild administration, but it had developed in a fairly normal manner, and it was not necessary for the J.C.A. to interfere to any appreciable extent with its internal conditions. Again, the private colonies of Baron Rothschild, Ekron and Metula, would certainly have developed along similar lines to the wine-producing colonies (such as Rishon-le-Zion and Zichron Jakob) if they had remained longer under the Rothschild administration. As it is, they have avoided the evils of mono-culture and are fairly prosperous.

The J.C.A. did much for the colonies besides the services already mentioned. It sought for fresh markets for the wine; purchased cornlands in the neighbourhood of the existing colonies; introduced a variety of agricultural industries, especially that of cattle-rearing; and laid out remunerative plantations. Also, the J.C.A. introduced a credit system, which, in view of the loose system previously in vogue, was of the utmost importance. Under the Rothschild administration a credit system in the European sense was non-existent. Money was lent to the colonists, but there was no attempt to exact repayment. In course of time, the colonists naturally began to look upon the administration as an inexhaustible fountain of wealth. This could only have one result, that of demoralisation, and naturally the attempt of the J.C.A. to introduce a credit system on the European plan was at first bitterly resented. But in time the system became well established, and bore good fruit. Money was lent to colonies or to individual colonists to tide them over difficult periods, but always at a reasonable rate of interest, and chiefly against securities or mortgages on the houses, farms and fixtures. It was a condition of the loan that the principal should be redeemed within a certain period. These conditions were strictly enforced, whenever the J.C.A. advanced money for the improvement of existing land, the purchase of new land, the laying out of plantations, or similar purposes, and thus reckless borrowing and extravagance were checked by the

knowledge that a loan was not a gift in disguise. The results, both economic and moral, were very valuable, particularly as the older colonists gave place to a younger generation with more initiative and a better capacity for adapting itself to the new conditions.

Besides taking over the Rothschild colonies and improving them the J.C.A. administration carried out an independent programme of colonisation in Palestine. It assisted by means of loans individual colonists in independent colonies like Rechoboth, Katra, Chederah, without involving the borrowers in loss of independence, which had been the usual consequence of accepting help in the Rothschild period. In this way the J.C.A. contributed materially to the development of such colonies as Rechoboth and Chederah, which were able to grow quickly because their lands were owned by private persons with means, or by Plantation Companies.

Before long, thanks to the work of the J.C.A., the era of the "dependent" colony had come to an end, and the Rothschild colonies had been placed on a healthy independent basis. The J.C.A. then extended the area of colonisation by founding new colonies of its own. This further development began with the laying out of an agricultural farm-school at Sedjera, in Lower Galilee. It was the policy of the J.C.A. to settle only colonists who had some experience of farming and some resources. To this end it introduced a system of farm-leases, under which the colonists first held their lands as tenants, and were given definite possession only after a period of trial. On this principle the colony of Sedjera, adjoining the farm-school, was founded in 1900. In 1902 the J.C.A. established the colonies of Mesha, Melhamieh, and Jemma, and in 1905 Bedjen, all in Lower Galilee. In 1906 the Odessa Committee established a workmen's colony, Bir Jakob, near Rechoboth. In 1907 the J.C.A. settled tenant farmers in the colony of Atlit. In 1908 two new colonies were founded by the J.C.A., Kinnereth and Mizpah in Lower Galilee. In this district also an American Company, "The Achuzah," bought a piece of land, which is to be the site of a new colony, called Poriah.

Whatever the Zionist Organisation may have done in the last decade, the work of the J.C.A. in the Jewish colonies remains of the utmost importance. By a sound and courageous policy the J.C.A. led the colonies from a state of uncertainty of development, brought about by indiscriminate philanthropy,

to one of independence. The colonies were now built on a sure foundation, and given normal conditions there could be no turning back. Each colonist owned or partly owned the land on which he worked and lived. He lived in a free atmosphere; he was no more a "Luftmensch," but was firmly rooted to the soil. It is not a matter for wonder, therefore, that the success of the Jewish colonies was henceforward assured. To this result the J.C.A. has helped considerably, and most of all in developing the spirit of confidence which has gradually evolved. What the Zionist Movement has done is to compel the colonies to give expression in education, economic institutions, and cultural development to this free spirit of Jewish independence.

It was in 1907 that the Zionist Congress at The Hague decided to devote its efforts and work chiefly to what was then termed "practical Zionism." The line of distinction between "practical" and "political" Zionism has already been explained in an earlier pamphlet. Suffice it to say here that it was in a happy and fortunate moment that the Zionist Organisation decided to take a practical interest in the material and cultural development of the Jewish colonies in Palestine; for this was the only way in which the movement could give practical expression to its aims and aspirations. Briefly summarised, the achievements of the Zionist movement in Palestine are these. It has taken the initiative in creating a complete and comprehensive credit system; it has destroyed once and for all the idea that any other language than Hebrew can be the language of the Jews in Palestine; it has brought into Palestine young Jewish pioneers with means, strength of will and determination to succeed; and above all, it has demonstrated that the Jewish colonists form the nucleus of a new nation, with the will and the capacity to carve out its own destiny, and live its own life, in the free atmosphere of its own culture and traditions.

The Zionist Organisation began its colonising activity in Palestine by founding an agricultural farm-school on a site called Kinnereth. In the meantime the Jewish National Fund was established by Congress, for the purpose of acquiring land in Palestine which should belong permanently to the Jewish people. In practice the Fund has been used to support and promote many undertakings of public utility, and has thus materially assisted the general progress of the work

of colonisation. In 1907 the Fund bought a piece of land of nearly 500 acres on the railway, midway between Jaffa and Jerusalem, and planted a grove of olive trees, now known as the Herzl Forest. The small colony adjacent to the Forest, called Hulda, was founded in 1909.

Other colonies founded directly by the various instruments of the Zionist Organisation are Ben Shamen, Merehavia, Djemama, Bir Adas, Kefrurieh, and Kerkur. The Zionist Movement has naturally been instrumental indirectly in the founding of other new colonies, by giving the necessary stimulus to individuals and societies who have taken an active interest in the work of Jews in Palestine by reason of the Zionist propaganda carried on amongst them. Such Societies are the Aehuzah (mentioned above) and, of more recent birth, the Maccabaeon Land Co., an English foundation. Another interesting development of the Zionist period is the growth of "workmen's colonies," where small allotments are held by labourers who spend most of their time working for the farmers in the neighbouring larger colonies.

It is, however, in the realm of economic system and education that the Zionist organisation has shown most initiative and originality. By the formation of the Anglo-Palestine Bank and the Palestine Land Development Co., both offshoots of the Jewish Colonial Trust, it has done much to stabilise industry and to give greater encouragement and support to the colonists. The bank was founded in 1903, and has now branches in Jaffa, Jerusalem, Haifa, Hebron, Beyrout, and Safed. It has thus become an important factor in the life of Palestine, and has recently played a great part in the development of the country.

The following passage from an article by Mr. D. Levontin, the manager of the Anglo-Palestine Co., in Jaffa, illustrates the difficulty which had to be met (despite the work of the J.C.A.) in establishing a Bank on sound business lines. "The basis upon which credit is allowed does not in every case consist of the solvency or the ability to pay on the part of the borrower, but very often, if one may so express oneself, upon the ability of the lender to enforce payment. . . . The effendi, for the most part a landowner in the neighbourhood or a merchant from a neighbouring town, who lends considerable sums in the village, also troubles himself very little about the borrower's ability to pay. . . . If the workman is

unable to pay, proceedings very often take place which are quite unknown in Europe. The effendi marches into the village of the debtor with his friends or soldiers placed at his disposal, and without much ado carries off some of his cattle by force. This is how the enforcement of payment is carried on here." The conditions among the colonists also produced a confused conception of credit, by reason of the philanthropic system adopted by the Rothschild administration and the Chovevé Zion. The Anglo-Palestine Co., however, succeeded in carrying further what the J.C.A. had begun, and in inculcating into the minds of the colonists the principles of a sound credit system. It granted no loans without security. It introduced the system of commercial bills at thirty and forty days, and discounted three months' bills. One of the principles adopted and strictly adhered to was never to advance to a society or to an individual a larger sum than was necessary for the carrying out of the enterprise concerned. This resulted in a normal development of the business undertaken, and acted as a check on rash speculation. It also meant that the industries assisted by loans would be established on a healthy basis. The Anglo-Palestine Company has also attempted to introduce co-operative societies on the European system, but as yet without success, as the colonies are not yet ready for such a system. It is however probable that in the near future co-operative societies will be created, when a certain stimulus has been given to the economic ideas of the colonists by the advent of a newer, younger and more scientific type of settler.

It is impossible to do justice in a few lines to the importance and value of the Anglo-Palestine Company in the work of Jewish Colonisation, but the following table will demonstrate how quick has been its development:—

	Dec. 31st, 1904.	Dec. 31st, 1908	Dec. 31st, 1911
Capital	£39,979	£71,103	£100,643
Reserve	—	£1,530	£6,000
Deposit and current accounts	£37,971	£114,097	£223,948
Savings and Loan Societies	£1,427	£9,005	£16,013
Loans to Co-op. Societies...	£323	£12,765	£17,044
Net Profit	£16	£4,890	£6,920
Dividend	—	4 $\frac{1}{8}$ per cent.	4 $\frac{1}{8}$ per cent.

The rapid growth in the value of deposits shows that the Company has gained the full confidence of the population. The Bank is largely used by Arabs as well as by Jews.

The Zionist movement, as already remarked, has been indirectly responsible for the formation of various land-purchasing and development companies, *i.e.*, groups or societies formed for the purpose of buying land in Palestine and developing it by placing agricultural labourers on the land, or leasing it to farmers. The most important of these companies is the Palestine Land Development Company, founded by the Zionist organisation with an authorised capital of £50,000, of which the capital employed is £10,000. The work of this company includes the cultivation of lands acquired by the Jewish National Fund. It also undertakes to work and develop land bought by private individuals or societies, and to buy land on behalf of private individuals (a complicated process under Turkish law). Further, it improves and develops its own and other lands, and deals with problems of sanitation and irrigation, so as to transfer the land at a later period to its actual owner in a state of productivity. It also undertakes to administer lands and estates on a system of sharing expenses, so as to give the small capitalist an opportunity of becoming a landowner. Thus the work of the Palestine Land Development Company has helped to encourage the acquisition of land by Jews of moderate means, and to form a class of small landowners such as is necessary to a healthy agricultural community.

Other companies of some importance are the "Geulah," founded in 1904; the Agudath Netaim, founded in 1905, which now has a capital of approximately £34,400; and the Tiberias Land and Plantation Company, founded in 1909, which has now funds amounting to £20,000. This last company has purchased a tract of land in the colony Mejdal, and has been successful in cultivating cotton on a small scale. The American Company, "Aehuzah," already mentioned, has a capital of £20,000. Other similar companies have been started in America, but these, like the Maccabean Land Company, have not yet reached the stage of purchasing land. An institution of a different kind, which is of great value for the agricultural development of Palestine, is the Agricultural Experiment Station at Atlit, which is directed by the well-known agronomist, Aaron Aaronsohn, and supported by American Jews.

The economic development which has been sketched above is almost purely agricultural. That is naturally so, because

the efforts of those who have worked for the regeneration of Palestine have been directed mainly to the acquisition of land and the training and settling of Jewish agriculturists. But, while the agricultural colonies are a solid achievement of the highest value for the realisation of the national ideal, the most striking results of the Jewish return to Palestine, so far as figures go, are to be found in the reactions of this small agricultural settlement on the towns. During the generation of colonising experiment the Jewish population of Jaffa has grown from a few hundreds to about 10,000; that of Haifa from a handful to about 2,000. In Jerusalem likewise the Jewish population, formerly recruited almost entirely from the aged and infirm, has received a large accession of more productive and progressive elements. This growth of urban Jewish settlements means a considerable expansion of trading interests, largely created by the increasing productivity of the agricultural colonies. Besides the individual traders and shopkeepers for whose activities scope has been provided by the development of the country, there are in particular two companies of something like public importance—The “Carmel” and the “Pardess,” the first of which controls the export of the wine produced in the Jewish colonies, while the second holds a similar position in the orange trade. This urban Jewish development has led to the foundation of a handsome suburb of Jaffa, called “Tel-Aviv,” which is Hebrew in language and is controlled entirely by its Jewish inhabitants. Similar quarters are to be founded in Haifa and in Jerusalem.

In the field of industry in the narrower sense the Jewish revival of Palestine has so far little to show. As yet Palestine has not the first requisites of an industrial country; it produces no coal, and roads, railways and canals are scarce. Manufactures are accordingly few. For most people in England the only evidence that work is done in Palestine at all lies in the articles of olive-wood which are (or purport to be) made in Jerusalem, and chiefly in missionary institutions. The Jewish interest in that kind of work is now represented chiefly by the Bezalel School of Arts and Crafts, which is school and workshop in one. Besides olive-wood articles the Bezalel produces carpets and metal and filigree work of high quality and in distinctively Jewish styles. In a country where industry is rudimentary the Bezalel plays a part of some importance. Soapmaking has also been tried in Palestine, but with indifferent

success. Of course, there is no lack of necessary industries such as building or tailoring. But in the wider sense the industrialisation of Palestine—if it is ever to come about at all—is all in the future. Nor is this to be regretted. A solid agricultural foundation is necessary for the new Jewish life, and while that is being created the rapid influx of industrial workers would raise problems with which the country is not yet in a position to deal.

Throughout what has been said above, reference to the present War and to its effects on Palestine has been designedly omitted. News from Palestine is naturally scarce and uncertain, and it is idle to speculate as to the present position when there are no data on which to form a judgment. For us here, in a sense, the Jewish settlement in Palestine does not exist in the present; it has only a past and a future. What it was before the War we know: a thing of small beginnings, but of promising beginnings. In a generation of devoted work, carried on by comparatively few people, with insufficient resources and under conditions by no means wholly favourable, some thirty agricultural colonies had been established and placed on their feet. A population of small landowners, peasant proprietors and agricultural labourers had been created, which had its roots in the soil of Palestine. Many of the colonies, especially Petach-Tikvah, had prospered exceedingly. At the same time, Jews had taken an ever-growing part in the commerce of Palestine, and had become, on the commercial as on the agricultural side, the most progressive element in its population. This position had been attained in 1914. The War may mean a check. But what has been created cannot be destroyed. The process of extending and consolidating will continue after the War, and, one may hope, at a more rapid rate. The first generation has carried us through the stage of experiment and halting progress. The next should be one of steady and continuous building on the foundations already won. The full consummation, in which we shall see in Palestine not a number of agricultural and urban settlements, but a single and well-built Hebrew settlement, may yet be distant; but it will come.

Zionism : Its Organisation and Institutions.

I. INTRODUCTION.

SINCE the day when the Jewish State was violently shattered by the military power of Rome, and the Jewish nation scattered into a number of fragmentary Jewries in every part of the earth, no attempt has been made, until quite recent times, to reunite the fragments—the several Jewries—into one larger Jewry. Not that the exile signified the complete detachment of one Jewry from other Jewries. On the contrary, for 17 or 18 centuries there was a very strong bond uniting the pieces into one whole. This larger Jewry, which was perhaps more a concept than an organised unity, was the *Kelal Yisroel*—the larger Israel—of which each separate Jewry considered itself a constituent part linked to the other parts by the powerful bond of *Torah*—the Jewish way of life and thought. So long as that way of life and thought was preserved intact and held the great majority of Jews, the bond was sufficiently strong to keep the parts united. The Synagogue and the House of Study were the external symbols of this unity of Israel, and in practice also the nucleus about which the separate Jewries lived and grew. But as the centuries rolled by, and the scattered Jewries were exposed to the influences of different environments, while the long-deferred hope of a national restoration began to give place to despair, the hold of the Jewish way of life, and with it the sense of unity, became weaker. The separate fragments of Jewry began to forget the rock whence they were hewn and to regard themselves as independent Jewries bearing only a distant relation to other Jewries. This partial severance from the *Kelal Yisroel* made each Jewry more susceptible to local

non-Jewish influences. The non-Jewish conception of religion as a dogma and a belief began to replace the older and truer Jewish idea of religion as mode of life, and this decline in turn made the severance more complete. The Jewish problem, the problem of restoring to the Jewish people what they had lost, began to be interpreted in a more limited manner as the problem for any particularly prosperous Jewry of helping other Jews of other Jewries which were less fortunate. The loss of vision revealed in this transformation is a measure of the disastrous effect of the exile on the ideals and clear-sightedness of the Jewish nation. Like the host of Sennacherib before the disaster, the leading Jews were stricken with blindness.

About the middle of the nineteenth century a reaction became noticeable, at first only shadowy and tentative, but more pronounced towards the close of the century. One of the earliest signs of this reaction was the foundation in 1860 of the *Alliance Israelite Universelle*, the object of which was in effect the restoration of the *Kelal Yisroel* feeling among the several Jewries. But in course of time the *Alliance* lost sight of its broader aim, and became a philanthropic institution, differing little in character from such later foundations as the Anglo-Jewish Association and the *Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden*. None of these organisations is in fact a universal Jewish body; each is representative of only one particular fragment of Jewry. They are associations of influential Jews of one or two countries to help and uplift poor and oppressed Jews in other countries. They are at the best a transition stage between the older *Kelal Yisroel* and its modern equivalent—the Zionist Movement; and it is interesting to distinguish between them. The former (as the very names in most cases indicate) are organisations whose members emphasise their separate and detached position as French, German, or English Jews who philanthropically endeavour to help their fellow Jews. They take it for granted that the Jewish people must always be scattered among the nations and that economic assistance together with Western education will suffice to save the poor and oppressed and (presumably) ignorant Jews in the East. The Zionist movement on the other hand goes back to the original Jewish problem of the restoration of the *Kelal Yisroel* and all that it signifies. It is thus in the direct line of the development of Jewish history. The movement and the organisation belong to no one country, and none can claim it as its particular organisation.

Its characteristic is its Jewishness. It is not a society of French Jews or German Jews, but of Jews. The leaders are elected by Jews in every country. Every Jew and every

Jewess over 18 years of age can vote for a representative. Its aims are such that no matter in what country a member lives he can work for them without conflicting with his citizen's duties to that country. The Zionist organisation is, in short, capable of numbering all Jews in its ranks and thus of uniting all the fragments of Jewry into a coherent whole.

The ideas on which the great Jewish philanthropic organisations were based were challenged first by Pinsker in 1882, and later, but quite independently, by Herzl in 1895. Neither was clearly conscious of the enormous difference in standpoint and outlook between his conception of the Jewish problem and the current conceptions, and both sought unsuccessfully to co-operate with the philanthropic organisations. Pinsker's views are to be found in his pamphlet *Auto-Emancipation*, written immediately after the terrible massacres of Jews in Russia in 1881. Individual Jews, so runs his argument, may indeed be saved by the efforts of philanthropic organisations: but what of the nation as a whole? That suffers, and suffers unjustly and bitterly, because of its homeless condition, and nothing less than the remedying of this vital defect can heal the wounds, both physical and spiritual, of Jewry. Pinsker's attitude and Herzl's later in the *Judenstaat* are based on the unity of Israel, while the philanthropic view postulates a scattered race, some parts of which, being more favourably treated than the rest, are animated by a very laudable desire to succour the less fortunate brethren. Pinsker and Herzl assume that Jews are a nation, though temporarily without a home. The Western philanthropists act on the theory that they, at any rate, have a home, and their best work is to improve the lot of Jews in that part of the world in which they happen to live. By their acceptance of this view they implicitly deny the unity of Israel. It is true that in fact at the present time the nation is scattered over the face of the earth, and that some fragments are more fortunate than the rest. But to deduce from these facts that such is the natural and permanent condition of the nation is to deny the very basis of Judaism.

Both Pinsker and Herzl projected a scheme for a new organisation to deal with the Jewish problem on new and really national lines. Their schemes are the first adumbration of what later came into existence as the Zionist Organisation and the Zionist Congress. The great philanthropic organisations like the *Alliance* are principally media for distributing funds to poor Jews and for organising schools in the East. They are managed by Committees of French, German, or English Jews according to the country of origin of the organisation. Quite different is the body of Jewish leaders imagined

by Pinsker in *Auto-Emancipation* and by Herzl in the *Judenstaat*. Its characteristic will be its Jewishness, and no country will be able to claim it as its own particular organisation. It is not to be a Society of French Jews nor of German Jews, but, to give it Herzl's name, simply a *Society of Jews*, be they Russian or American or Turkish. Every Jew or Jewess could be a member of such an organisation, and its leaders would be elected by Jews in every part of the world. If such an organisation established a school for Jews in Palestine, it would not produce, for instance, French men or women of Jewish origin, such as the *Alliance* schools have turned out, but purely Jewish men and women.

Pinsker translated his theory into practice by becoming the first president of the *Chovevé Zion* (Lovers of Zion)—a society established in 1881 for the specific purpose of helping to settle colonists in Palestine.

The aims of this Society were much more modest than Pinsker's, and in practice its work assumed at first a philanthropic character. None the less, it marked a great advance on the other philanthropic organisations, because practical colonisation of Palestine occupied the foremost place in its programme, and because it helped, under the stimulus of Achad Ha'am, Lilienblum, Levinsky and others, to spread the fundamental idea of all Zionist endeavour, viz., that in Palestine only can Jews hope to establish a settlement embodying those features of Jewish education and Jewish life which are characteristic of the Jewish spirit. The spread of the *Chovevé Zion* from Russia to Germany, France and England prepared the ground for the more ambitious organisation of Herzl, the modern Zionist organisation.

II. THE ZIONIST ORGANISATION.

The first Zionist Congress established the organisation and laid down the programme which it was to try and achieve. The programme (known as the Basle programme) defines the aim as follows :—

Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law.* The Congress contemplates the following means to the attainment of this end :—

1. The promotion, on suitable lines, of the Colonisation of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers.

* For a discussion of the precise meaning of the original phrase, see Pamphlet No. 1 (Zionism and the Jewish Problem), page 10.

2. The organisation and binding together of the whole of Jewry by means of appropriate institutions, local and international, in accordance with the laws of each country.

3. The strengthening and fostering of Jewish national sentiment and consciousness.

4. Preparatory steps towards obtaining government consent, where necessary, to the attainment of the aim of Zionism.

This statement of the programme has been on the whole extremely satisfactory. It is definite enough to be a useful guide, and yet it is sufficiently elastic to allow particular sections of Zionists to concentrate on any part of the programme which seems to them to be of pressing importance. In the earlier years of the movement the main efforts of the Zionist leaders were directed to the second and fourth parts of the programme, *i.e.*, to building up and perfecting the organisation and at the same time explaining the aims of Zionism to, and winning the sympathies of, the Turkish and other governments. Later, when the organisation was already in being and political conditions had changed in Turkey, the movement was able to concentrate on the first and third parts of the Basle programme by practical work in Palestine and by the education of the national sentiment in the younger generation of Jews and Jewesses.

The idea and the frame of the Zionist organisation are an adaptation of the democratic electoral systems prevailing in Western Europe and in America. All Jews and Jewesses of 18 years and upwards become members of the organisation by payment of a nominal fee called "shekel" and equivalent to one shilling, mark, franc, etc. Each member has one vote, and every group of 200 shekelpayers has the right to elect a delegate to the Zionist Congress. The Congress was formerly held annually, but since 1901 it has been held every two years. Each shekelpayer in order to be entitled to a vote must have paid his (or her) shekel for two successive years. In practice it is found rather difficult to keep exactly to divisions of 200, and it is permissible for a society numbering less than 200 members to amalgamate with another society for election purposes. Elected members must be not less than 24 years of age. A deputy is generally elected at the same time as a delegate to take his place in case of unavoidable absence from the Congress.

The Congress is the legislative body of the Zionist organisation. The delegates choose from among themselves a Committee of not less than 21 nor more than 60. The Congress then elects from out of this Committee a smaller Executive

Committee of six. Finally, the Congress elects a Chairman of the Executive Committee, who is also the President of the Congress and the head of the whole organisation. Dr. Theodor Herzl was the first head until his death in 1904. He was succeeded by David Wolffsohn, who was followed in 1911 by Professor Warburg. The headquarters of the organisation was originally Vienna, where Dr. Herzl lived, later Cologne, then Berlin, and since the War, Copenhagen. The aim of the movement has been to move the headquarters to Palestine as soon as conditions permit, because any other country can never be more than an accidental and temporary headquarters. The most convenient centre for the majority of Zionists would be in Russia, for though the frame of the organisation is West European, its life blood and strongest membership consists of Russian Jews. Berlin was only chosen because of its proximity to Russian Jewry. The Congresses would also have been held in Russia, if the situation of Russian Jewry had been normal.

The adherents of the movement are formed into Societies which in each country are nominally controlled by a local Zionist Federation or a Zionist Separate Union consisting of not less than 3,000 members. These Federations and Separate Unions are responsible to headquarters for the administrative work, *e.g.*, distribution and collection of the shekel, arrangement of elections, reception of leaders and arrangement of propaganda tours, and publication of Zionist literature in the language of the country. Among the more important Separate Unions are the Misrachi, strictly observant Zionists, the Poale Zion, who are Socialists as well as Zionists, and two bodies of Zionist working men united in friendly and benefit societies, the Order of Ancient Maccabees in England and the Order Knights of Zion in America. The organisation has been in existence since the first Congress in 1897, and many improvements have been effected at later Congresses. As a form for the general body of Zionist workers it is excellent, but its content has never fulfilled the hopes or expectations of its founder, Herzl. He tried to bind together the whole of Jewry in the organisation, but, unfortunately, Jewry was, and still is to a large extent, only nominally one people. The fragments in the different countries still consider themselves more or less independent of all other fragments. English Jews, speaking generally, are more English than Jews, and refuse to become members of any other semi-political organisation. They have their vote as British citizens, their Jewishness can find sufficient scope in a limited religious observance, and they cannot see any reason to become adherents of the Zionist organisation. The old religious bond

which united Jews into *Kelal Yisroel* is still sufficiently strong to keep them out of the new organisation, but not strong enough to ensure united action in times of crisis. At such times it is abundantly clear that the older bond has snapped and nothing has taken its place effectively. The Zionist leaders in their efforts to enrol the majority of Jews are faced with a dilemma. An organisation is required to bind together the fragmentary Jewries, and yet unless and until they feel themselves so bound together they will keep away from the organisation. The Zionist organisation is like a central electric switch-board communicating with every part of Jewry, but it can only bring a light to those parts in which the current—the Jewish sentiment—is found. There seems to be only one way out of this dilemma, and that is by education—in other words, by part three of the Basle programme. The Jews must be taught to feel themselves brothers to all other Jews. This educating process was commenced in modern times by the pogroms of 1881 and 1882 and has been continued by similar suffering. The sense of kinship has become still keener through the terrible suffering which the main body of Jewry—Russian and Polish Jewry—has undergone during the War. Their sufferings must have burnt into every Jewish heart the sense of the *Kelal Yisroel*, and should form the starting point of a new era.

Though the organisation has not succeeded in enlisting all the support which its founder anticipated, it possesses in the Zionist Congress an instrument of uniting Jewry such as has been lacking for many centuries. The Congress has been able to speak in the name of Jews of every country in the world. Its chief value has been to convert Jews from a settled disbelief in their own powers as a people into a realm of confidence in the ultimate realisation of their dream of a new national life. There is no other body of representative Jews which could be approached with questions affecting the whole Jewish people, and particularly its future as a people.

The Congresses have until now lasted five or six days, and most of them have been held at Basle. The number of delegates is about 500, representing about 200,000 votes and a much larger number of sympathisers. One of the features at the 11 Congresses already held has been a survey of the happenings to Jewry all over the World. This survey emphasises the Jewish and international character of the assembly.

In years when no Congress is held there is a conference of the large Executive Committee, which has powers corresponding to those of the Congress with the exception of electing the

Executive. The expenses of the headquarters and of the Congresses are covered by receipts from Shekolim and by private contributions to a Central Fund for that purpose.

The language of the Congresses hitherto has been mainly German, but the knowledge of Hebrew is making rapid progress, and Hebrew, which is already the official language, bids fair to become the ordinary language of all international Zionist assemblies, as it logically should be.

The instrument of publicity of the organisation is a Jewish publication company—the Jüdischer Verlag of Berlin. It has published a large number of pamphlets and brochures on various phases of Zionist activity, the Zionist writings of Pinsker, Hess, Herzl, Nordau and others, and translations and editions of other works calculated to strengthen Jewish national feeling. It also publishes works of Jewish art by Struck, Lilien and other well-known artists. The headquarters official organ is “Die Welt,” established by Herzl in 1897. The organisation has also an official Hebrew paper, *Ha-olam*. Most of the Federations have official publications of their own and publish propaganda literature.

III. THE ZIONIST INSTITUTIONS.

The institutions of a movement are the instruments for the attainment of the objects laid down in the programme. During the first ten years of the movement the political ideas of Herzl were uppermost, and to them we owe in addition to the organisation, the two most important institutions of the movement. These are the Jewish Colonial Trust and the Jewish National Fund.

The Jewish Colonial Trust (Juedische Colonial Bank) Limited is the main financial instrument of the movement. It is an English limited liability company established in 1899 (after the Second Zionist Congress) with the object of investing Jewish capital in Palestine and the neighbourhood. The right was reserved to keep the capital invested in Europe so long as the Directors considered it advisable. In 1907, when the “political” began to give place to the more strictly Palestinian tendency owing to the accession of strength of the Russian Zionists, after the struggle over East Africa at the Sixth and Seventh Congresses,* this power was withdrawn, and all capital was restricted to investment in Palestine and the immediately surrounding lands. The nominal capital of the Company is two millions sterling. Had the full amount

* See Pamphlet No. 3 (History of Zionism), p. 11.

been subscribed it is very probable that Herzl would have been able to purchase large tracts of Turkish Crown land in Palestine according to his constant endeavour. But the rich Jews held back, and the poor Jews could only subscribe about £260,000, which was totally insufficient for Herzl's purpose. Nevertheless, though the political aims which the founders had in mind were not realised, the funds of the Trust were of the greatest use later in opening up the industries of Palestine and in establishing the basis of an agricultural credit system. This invaluable work was accomplished when the failure of the political efforts outside Palestine had led the organisation to concentrate on active development in Palestine. Throughout the history of Zionism there is the same tendency to utilise any available instrument, even though established with quite another object, to further the real object of the movement. This change is seen in the establishment of subsidiary companies working with capital supplied by the Trust. These companies are the Anglo-Palestine Company (1903), the Anglo-Levantine Banking Company (1908), and the Palestine Land Development Company (1908).

The chief of these, the Anglo-Palestine Company, is an English limited liability company with a capital of £100,000. It undertakes all kinds of banking business and has branches in Jaffa, Jerusalem, Hebron, Haifa, Beirut, Safed, and Tiberias. The Anglo-Palestine Company has from the beginning of its activity adopted as its object the furthering of the existing Jewish settlement in Palestine by every means and the paving of the way for a more extensive Jewish settlement. It had therefore to regard as its first task the organising of the credit system in the land and to pay particular attention to the economic strengthening of the Jewish population, urban and rural. So far as the colonists were concerned, the principal thing was to assist them by means of short-term loans and otherwise, in the buying of land, the laying out and equipment of their plantations, and the sale of their products. In the towns the main thing necessary was to enable the native Jewish merchants and manufacturers by means of credits to compete with the other elements of the population and to assist new Jewish settlers in securing a livelihood. It was inevitably necessary to enter into relations with the non-Jewish population also. Owing to the primitive conceptions of credit in Palestine the Anglo-Palestine Company at first met with considerable difficulties, but they were overcome, and the progress of the Bank has been sustained and gratifying. The amount of short-term loans rose from £9,500 in 1903 to nearly £260,000 in 1912. The Turkish land laws hamper long-term credit on mortgage, nevertheless the A.P.C. has

granted loans of this kind for building houses and workmen's dwellings and to colonists amounting to nearly £30,000. The A.P.C. has taken much interest in developing co-operative societies, and the capital invested by it in such enterprises rose from £2,750 in 1906 to £20,000 in 1912. It has enabled the colonists to farm the land-tax for themselves and so reduced the burden of it by one-half. It has advanced loans to educational institutions, Hebrew newspapers and charitable institutions amounting to nearly £4,000. The turnover of the A.P.C. in 1912 is given in the official report as £15,360,000; the deposits at 31st December, 1912, to £270,000. The dividend was $4\frac{1}{8}$ per cent.

The Anglo-Levantine Banking Company has an authorised capital of £100,000, of which about £26,000 is paid up. The Company had an office in Constantinople from which most of the business was done.

The Palestine Land Development Company, Limited (founded 1908) has an authorised capital of £50,000, of which about £20,000 is paid up. The Company works lands of the National Fund and other corporations or individuals, carries through land-purchase, a complicated business in Palestine, prepares and divides up land for sale, administers estates of absentee owners, and trains labour. Although the paid-up share capital is not large in amount, the Palestine Land Development Company has carried through very large transactions, and should become the right hand of the Zionist organisation and Zionists in the work of acquiring Palestine land when conditions become normal.

The other valuable institution established in the early days of Zionism with more or less conscious political aims is the Jewish National Fund, founded in 1901. This too has been changed by the force of events into an instrument for the development, both agricultural and urban, of Palestine. The Fund is organised as an English limited liability company. The income is provided by voluntary contributions, which are made throughout the Jewish world. Its object is the acquisition of land in Palestine as the inalienable property of the Jewish people. The capital of the fund stood at £18,658 in 1903 and at £161,000 in 1912. It is now about £200,000. The income was £13,750 in 1908 and £29,000 in 1912. The amount invested in Palestine was in 1912 £112,000. There are no dividends, because there is no profit seeking, and the only shareholders are trustees. The funds are employed largely through the agency of the Anglo-Palestine Company and other companies working in Palestine for the Jewish cause. The ingenious methods of collecting the Fund have contributed

largely to its popularity and success. Special stamps for use with letters and telegrams, collections at Jewish ceremonies, collecting boxes at home, a Golden Book for donations of £10 and over, a day set apart as National Fund Flower Day, are a few of the best known ways devised for increasing the Fund.

Very much akin to the National Fund is the Olive Tree Fund. This was established in 1905 for the reforestation of the land belonging to the National Fund by planting olive trees. Many thousands of trees have already been planted on the National Fund estates at Ben Shamen and Hulda. This work as it progresses will give permanent employment to many Jewish agriculturists. The methods of obtaining subscriptions for the Olive Tree Fund closely resemble those of the National Fund. The profit of the plantations will be devoted to educational objects.

Since about 1907, when the movement began to address itself more closely to Palestinian colonisation, Congress has established a number of institutions subservient to that end, which supplement the work of the two main institutions already described.

The first step was the establishment of a Palestine office at Jaffa. This office, under the management of Dr. Arthur Ruppin, has been of the very greatest use, and to it may be credited much of the success of the new Jewish settlement in Palestine. Practically every Palestinian institution has been either worked or aided by the Palestine office of the Zienist Organisation.

At the Sixth Congress Dr. Franz Oppenheimer brought forward a scheme for a Jewish Settlement in Palestine on novel co-operative lines. At the Ninth Congress (1910) the scheme was sanctioned and a Company (Erez Israel Colonisation Association, Limited) was started to obtain the means of settling the pioneers. In 1911 the experiment was commenced on a small scale at Merchavia, and it was continued later at Daganian, near Lake Tiberias. The development of Merchavia and Daganian will be watched with great interest by all Zionists and by many non-Zionists who would like to see the removal of the ills attendant on the capitalist system.

The David and Fanny Wolffsohn Fund (1907) is a branch of the Jewish National Fund, devoted to the building of workmen's dwellings in the colonies. Houses have been built in Rishon le Zion, Petach Tikvah, Rehoboth, and Wadi Chanin.

The *Kedem* is dedicated to Jewish National Education in Palestine. It was founded (as a limited company) in 1912 by an endowment of 40,000 francs. Its object is to assist all projects which tend to educate the Palestinian Jews in every way, intellectually and morally by the creation of schools, libraries, nurseries, reading rooms, Toynbee Halls, technical institutes, etc., and physically by establishing athletic societies and training schools for physical culture.

IV. SEMI-ZIONIST INSTITUTIONS.

The institutions above mentioned are the only Zionist institutions in the strict sense of having been established by resolutions of Congress. But the nationalist spirit has brought into being a host of institutions for the development of the Jewish Settlement in Palestine, most of which co-operate closely with the Zionist institutions proper.

The earliest and perhaps the most important of such nationalist institutions is the Odessa Committee.* This body (founded in 1889) represents the early colonisation societies founded in Russia. By a resolution of 1902 between 25-30 per cent. of its income must be devoted to educational purposes in Palestine. Its chief concern is with departments neglected by other organisations, such as the foundation of workmen's colonies and the subsidising of commercial institutions in the Colonies and providing grants for doctors, chemists, watchmen, &c. It also plans gardens and garden cities. It maintains the girls' secondary school at Jaffa, together with the associated teachers' seminary and kindergartens, and it subsidises numerous other schools, especially in the Colonies. The Committee, more than any other organisation, keeps in mind the cultural and spiritual side of colonisation work, and its services on behalf of the Hebrew language are incalculable. In 1910-11 it spent £16,425 in Palestine, over £6,000 of this sum on education.

The Jewish Colonisation Association, which administers the fortune of £10,000,000 bequeathed by Baron de Hirsch for the benefit of the Jewish people, has of recent years been active in Palestine, though even now by far the largest portion of its annual income is expended outside Palestine.

In Palestine the Association conducts the administration of the Colonies subsidised by Baron Edmond de Rothschild, gives subventions to some of the Colonies and the *Alliance*

* The Odessa Committee is virtually the Chovevé Zion of earlier years.

Schools, runs a loan bank in Jerusalem and has undertaken certain building operations in Jerusalem. It is possible that the Association will extend its activity in Palestine, because the results there are more satisfactory than in any other part of the World.

There have also sprung up in recent years many semi-Zionist bodies which aim at land purchase in Palestine. The chief are the *Geulah* (a Russian Company) founded in 1902, the *Agudat Netaim* (a Turkish Company) founded in 1905, controlling about 10,000 acres, the Tiberias Land and Plantation Company (1909) and the Palestine Real Estate Company (1910).

The most recent forms of colonisation agencies are the Achuza Companies (mostly American) and an English company on similar lines—The Maccabean Land Company.

The Achuzas are companies, or rather co-operative societies, for the foundation of Colonics. The first, started in St. Louis, U.S.A., has an authorised capital of 10,000 dollars. It has acquired and founded the Colony Poriah. The idea is to make settlement in Palestine possible for persons of modest means. The payments are spread over a term of years, and it is intended that every holder of seven shares shall settle in Palestine within ten years. On the model of the St. Louis Achuza similar societies have been formed in Canada, England and South Africa, and they represent one of the most interesting and promising of colonisation agencies. The English Achuza is a limited liability company called The First London Hoachoozo, Limited, 1914. It has bought land at Kerkur.

The Maccabean Land Company is the first organised attempt of English Jews to purchase and cultivate land in Palestine for Jewish settlers. The Company was established by the Order of Ancient Maccabeans, which is a Separate Union within the Zionist organisation. The authorised capital of the Company is £62,000, and the chief purpose is to establish a Maccabean Colony in Palestine on which some of the shareholders will be able eventually to settle. The Company was negotiating for the purchase of a suitable tract of land when the War broke out.

CONCLUSION.

Whatever fate befall Palestine as the outcome of the Great War, the Jewish people as a whole will have to readjust its position in the world to the new situation which will arise. In this readjustment who will take the leading part?

In the Zionist organisation we have an excellent instrument for this purpose ready to commence work. No other organisation is in such close contact with the multitude of Jewries in the world. The Zionist Congress can be the centre and starting point for the new efforts. It has the power, provided the representation is sufficiently large, to deliberate and decide on behalf of all Jewry.

While the organisation is competent to deal with the Jewish problem as a whole, most of the institutions of Zionism are peculiarly adapted to meet the situation that will no doubt arise in Palestine. If large concessions of land are obtainable, the purchase can be made through the Zionist bank—the Jewish Colonial Trust—and through the Jewish National Fund. The actual negotiations and even the details of the conveyance may be entrusted to the Palestine office at Jaffa, which has had a large experience of land purchase in Palestine. Then again, the land will require to be parcelled out into small holdings for individual settlers and prepared for those who cannot prepare the land for themselves. This work is the special province of the Palestine Land Development Company and similar Companies such as Geulah and Agudat Netaim and the Aehuza Companies.

As the majority of the new colonists will be possessed of but small resources, a credit system will be required to tide over the first few years before they become self-supporting. This can be done by the Anglo-Palestine Company, the Jewish National Fund, and the Loan Societies. The erection of workmen's dwellings, the bringing into Palestine of Yemenite Jews for the kind of work done by Arab labour, the providing of a local constabulary or night guards against marauding Bedouins, the building of garden suburbs—all these have already been contemplated and prepared for. Nearly every imaginable need of a new colony has been anticipated, and there is already in existence, and in working order, the very instrument for its accomplishment.

The majority of the Jewish individuals or families who will leave the belligerent countries after the War will, no doubt, set their faces towards those lands which offer the best economic opportunities, but some of them, actuated by their nationalist feeling, will wish to emigrate to Palestine. Advisory bureaux can be set up to give advice and perhaps a free passage to the most suitable of such emigrants and to keep away those unfitted to help in rebuilding the national life. The work done hitherto by the Odessa Committee and the Palestine office will increase considerably, and perhaps branches will need to be established in other Jewish centres.

The Jewish settlement in Palestine is still, however, a plant of tender age. The War has not been without its withering effect upon it, and careful attention is needed to restore it to its early vigour. But it is strong enough to survive the temporary blast. The roots of the revival are deeply embedded, the soil in which the roots have struck is very fertile. All that is required to enable the new growth to flourish and blossom is calm and sunshine—freedom from persecution and facilities for unbroken activity on the part of the best elements of the Jewish people—the elements which are working towards its restoration to a healthy national life. It is in the Zionist Organisation, the concrete embodiment of Herzl's great vision, that these elements can and should be united.

NOTE.

The ten pamphlets of this series aim at giving a complete general outline of the various aspects of Zionist thought and work. The literature on the subject is extensive, but comparatively little of it is in the English language. The following list of the most important works will be of use to readers who wish to study the subject in fuller detail. It is confined, with one or two exceptions, to books in the English language.

HERZL'S ZIONIST WRITINGS, especially *Der Judenstaat*, of which there is an English translation, "The Jewish State."

NORDAU: Various Speeches and Pamphlets, principally in German.

ACHAD HA'AM (Asher Ginzberg): Selected Essays. Translated from the Hebrew by Leon Simon (Jewish Publication Society of America, 608, Chestnut Street, Philadelphia).

PINSKER, LEO: *Auto-Emancipation*. (English version under title of *Self-Emancipation*, London, 1891.)

GOTTHEIL, RICHARD: *Zionism* (Jewish Publication Society of America).

GOODMAN, PAUL, and **LEWIS, ARTHUR D.** (Editors): *Zionism—Problems and Views*. (Fisher Unwin, 1916.)

SACHER, H. (Editor): *Zionism and the Jewish Future*. (John Murray, 1916.)

- NAWRATZKI, KURT : Die Jüdische Kolonisation Palästinas.
(Munich, 1914.)
- TRIETSCH, DAVIS : Palästina. (Third Edition, Berlin, 1912.
English translation of second edition.)
- TSCHLENOW, E. W. : Fünf Jahre der Arbeit in Palästina.
(Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1913.)
- HYAMSON, ALBERT M. : Palestine. The Rebirth of an
Ancient People. (Sidgwick & Jackson, 1916.)
- COHEN, ISRAEL (Editor) : Zionist Work in Palestine.
(Fisher Unwin, 1911.)
- SZOLD, HENRIETTA : Recent Jewish Progress in Palestine.
(Jewish Publication Society of America, 1916.)
- JANNAWAY, F. G. : Palestine and the Jews. (Birmingham,
1914.)



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01009 8566